J
125
N3
24
H
19
C

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

During the First Session of the Twenty-Fourth General Assembly of Newfoundland

1920

UNION PUBLISHING COMPANY, LTD.

Proceedings

OF THE

House of Assembly of Newfoundland

SESSION 1920

WEDNESDAY, April 20, 1920.

Upon the twentieth day of April, A.D. 1920, the members returned for the several districts, with the exception of Archibald Targett, Esq., assembled between the hours of two and three of the clock in the afternoon in the Council Chamber and took and subscribed the oath of allegiance before the Honourables Robert K. Bishop, James D. Ryan, and Marmaduke G. Winter, the commissioners of His Excellency the Governor thereto appointed.

At three of the clock the members being assembled in the Assembly room, the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod delivered a message from His Excellency the Governor requesting the attendance of the members in the Council Chamber where His Excellency's commission having been read by the Clerk, the Commissioners signified that the members should forthwith return to their own chamber and elect a proper person to be their Speaker and present such person to His Excellency on to-morrow in the Council Chamber at three of the clock.

Whereupon the members having returned to the Assembly Room, the Prime Minister, the Honourable Richard A. Squires, K.C., moved that the Member for the District of Carbonear, William F. Penney, Esquire, do take the chair as Speaker, and it was seconded by the Honourable William R. Warren, K.C., Member for the District of Fortune; and no other person being proposed, Mr. Penney was unanimously called to the Chair by the House, and was conducted to the Chair by the members who proposed and seconded him.

Whereupon the Speaker, standing on the steps addressed the House, expressing his gratitude to the Honourable Members for the high honor unanimously conferred on him.

The House then adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, at half-past two of the clock in the afternoon.

WEDNESDAY, April 21st, 1920.

The House met at half-past two of the clock in the afternoon, pursuant to adjournment.

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

Whereupon Mr. Speaker and the House attended His Excellency in the Council Chamber and being returned to the Assembly Room, Mr. Speaker informed the House that when in at-

tendance upon His Excellency in the Council Chamber, His Excellency had been pleased to approve of his election as Speaker of this House and that in the name and on behalf of the House of Assembly he had by humble petition to His Excellency laid claim to all their ancient rights and privileges, which His Excellency had confirmed to them in as full and ample a manner as they have been heretofore granted or allowed by His Excellency or any of his predecessors. Mr. Speaker also expressed his respectful acknowledgements for the high honor which the House had unanimously conferred upon him.

The following Resolution was proposed by Sir Michael Cashin and seconded by Mr. Bennett:

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this early opportunity of congratulating you upon the high office you hold in this House. I think it is the first time in the memory of this House that a full-blooded fisherman has occupied the Chair. I congratulate you, Sir, on behalf of the fishermen of the Colony, and I believe it to be a move in the right direction, that the fishermen of the Colony are coming into their own. I have implicit confidence in you, and not only have I this confidence but I extend it out to you from the members of the Opposition in this House. Now, Sir, before any business is transacted in this House, I ask your permission to move this Resolution:

WHEREAS, the Prime Minister, the Leader of this House, has been accused upon the oath of a former member of this House, of crimnial misconduct in relation to the election of a Member hereof;

AND WHEREAS, the Governor in Council has announced an intention to appoint a Commission under the public Inquiries Act to take evidence upon oath and to report its findings therein, in relation to the truth or otherwise of the said charge;

RESOLVED, that in the opinion of this House it should not proceed to the transaction of public business under the leadership of an accused person awaiting trial;

AND THEREFORE, that this House should now adjourn for one week to give opportunity for the said inquiry and report.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I don't think that the Resolution should be received or debated until the Speaker has reported himself as having been approved of by His Excellency the Governor.

MR. HIGGINS:—The position is that when the Address from the Throne is read to both Houses the Legislature is then open, you taking the Chair; incidentally, Sir, I wish to congratulate you sincerely and trust that, under your guidance there will be carried on the highest traditions of all those who preceded you. I think it is a great tribute to the mass of our people that one from amongst the fishermen of the country has been selected for the position of Speaker.

With regard to the point of order ruled by the learned Minister of Justice I wish to refer him to Rule No. 19 of the House:

That rule is really the practice in England and the reason of it is that the moment that the Speaker occupies the Chair Parliament is open and the House is in session. I might also refer my learned friend to the eleventh edition of Mays' Parliamentary Rules, page 174.

Might I say with all respect to the Honourable Minister of Justice that it will be found upon reflection that that is the constitutional practice and that the House is now in session. I, therefore, move that the motion of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is in order.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—

Mr. Speaker, I do not quite agree with the hon. member for St. John's East. What he has said would apply if this were not a new session. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is entitled to make his motion before the Speech from the Throne is read, but after having returned to this Chamber the Speaker has to report what transpired in the Legislative Council. I wish to refer to rule 11 and rule 12 which direct the procedure:

Those rules must be carried out before a motion is made and before the carrying on of any other business. The Speaker has to report that the House has been in attendance upon His Excellency the Governor and that the privileges of the House have been conserved, and then takes his seat. My honourable friend would then be quite in order to make his motion in the ordinary course.

HON. THE SPEAKER:—I take the position that I have not been confirmed in this House as Speaker until I had reported that His Excellency the Governor had approved of my election and I rule that the motion made by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is out of order. After I have announced that His Excellency approved of my election and the House of Assembly is in session, the Leader of the Opposition or any other member is perfectly at liberty to put forward any resolution or any motion he likes. I shall now proceed.

I have to inform the House that when in attendance upon His Excellency the Governor in the Council Chamber, His Excellency was pleased to approve of my election as Speaker of this House; and that in the name and on behalf of the House of Assembly I, by humble petition to His Excellency, laid claim to all its rights and privileges, which His Excellency had confirmed in as full and ample a manner as they have been heretofore granted or allowed by His Excellency or any of his predecessors. I beg to repeat my respectful acknowledgments to this House, for the high honor which it has unanimously conferred upon me.

I further announce that whist in the Council Chamber, His Excellency was pleased to make a gracious speech to both branches of the Legislature, a copy of which, for purposes of greater accuracy I have obtained, and will now read to the House.

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

I deem it my first duty on this occasion to greet the new members who have been appointed to the Legislative Council in the place of some whose loss we deplore I also welcome all those who have been elected to to serve in the new House of Assembly.

When in April of last year I addressed the Legislature on the opening of the Eight and last session of the 23rd General Assembly, I expressed my feelings of pride and thankfulness at the wonderful success of the Allies armies in the great world war, and thankfulness at the termination of the conflict which had cost such untold miseries to the greater portion of the human race; and in greeting you today, while I recognize that the ratification of the first of the Treaties of Peace in January last holds out high hope that the nations of the world have indeed embarked upon a period of reoganization and reconstruction, I cannot avoid impression upon you the lesson of all history, that a great convulsion is followed by much unrest, and that all our patience and sympathy will be required before we can realize under the guidance of Divine Providence a permanent peace upon earth and goodwill amongst formerly warring nations

My Ministers appreciate the donation by the British Admiralty to Newfoundland of two ships hitherto used for naval purposes. These two ships, together with a third ship purchased from the British Admiralty by the Government, are now being prepared at Chatham for their voyage to Newfoundland. It is probable that one of these ships will be used as a coastal boat; another as a supply ship in connection with the Lighthouse Department, and the third for emergency and rescue purposes.

For many years a dispute has been pending between the Provinces of Quebec and this Colony in relation to the boundary between Newfoundland and Quebec on the Labrador Peninsula. An agreement has been arrived at as to the submission of the dispute to the adjudication of His Majesty's Privy Council, and it is thought probable that some substantial progress towards a final settlement of this longstanding controversy may be made during this year.

Promptly after its assumption of office the Government established regulations to protect the fishing interests of Newfoundland in their foreign markets, and it is pleasing to know that the establishment of the regulations has been attended with much success and substantial benefit to our codfish industry. The fishermen of Newfoundland will be invited to co-operate earnestly with the Government in its effort to improve the cure of codfish. It can reasonably be anticipated that if the cure of fish be improved so that a prime article is produced, the price of Newfoundland codfish will continue at firm values.

An effort is being made by the Government to wind up the Department of Militia and the Department of Shipping at the earliest possible moment. The Newfoundland Pay and Record Office in London has already been closed. The work of the Civil Re-Establishment Committee will ,it is hoped, during this year be brought practically to an end, and the matter of medical treatment of returned soldiers and sailors will be concentrated in one hospital building so as to give greater efficiency of service at a very greatly reduced expenditure of public funds. If the burden of expenditure resulting from the war may seem a heavy one let us remember that it represents the least that we can do for those who enabled Newfoundland to take her stand in the forefront of humanity's great battle.

The Rev. (Major) Nangle has been placed in charge of matters connected with the concentration and registration of the graves of our heroic dead in Europe. Suitable War Memorials are being erected on sites purchased by the Newfoundland Government. The battlefield of Beaumont Hamel, the name of which will ever be a tragic memory amongst us, has been secured, and here, within enclosures dedicated to the cause of liberty and justice by Newfoundland's heroic sacrifices, will be concentrated the graves of all members of the Royal Newfoundland Regiment who fell in the advance of July 1st, 1916.

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

The revenue for the last fiscal year showed a substantial surplus over expenditure. On the other hand, there have been large expenditures not included within the scope of last year's Estimates which it will be necessary to legalize. In spite of these large disbursements the revenue was more than sufficient to meet current expenditure. It must be remembered, however, that practically the whole of the very large expense incurred in connection with the Department of Militia and in the matter of pensions for soldiers and sailors and their hospital treatment and civil re-estab-

lishment was borne on Capital Account.

The Estimates have been subject to considerable revision, and have been based upon the report of the Civil Service Commission appointed by my late Ministers. My Ministers propose to submit to you for your careful consideration a bona fide statement of the moneys which are estimated to be necessary to cover the expense of the public service of the Colony for the coming fiscal year. They are of the opinion that the practice which has grown up during recent years of submitting Estimates far below the actual anticipated expenditure, trusting to provision being made under the head of "Supplemental Supply" at a subsequent session of the Legislature for the authorization of over-expenditure, should be discontinued as far as practicable.

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

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

The Department of Marine and Fisheries, which may be considered one of the most important Departments of the Administration, will be reorganized; an Information Bureau and Scientific Research Department will be established; a commission will be appointed to put into operation laws for the standardization of fish and the improvement of the cure thereof. Trade Commissioners and other agents will be appointed from time to time until Newfoundland is suitably represented in all its principal fish markets. Legislation will be introduced to provide for the enforcement of such regulations as my Ministers may consider necessary to protect the interests in foreign countries of those who ship fish to the foreign market.

Legislation will be introduced to establish a proper survey of ships built in Newfoundland and of all vessels engaged in the foreign trade of the Island. This legislation will include provision for the protection of the lives of those employed on foreign-going vessels.

You will be invited to consider bills for the creation of a Department of Posts and Telegraphs and the creation of a Department of Education. A reorganization of the Department of Agriculture and Mines is being undertaken with a view to the curtailment of expenditures which past practice has indicated to be unfruitful and the development of a new policy which my Ministers confidently believe will tend to make agriculture a very much more important factor in the Colony's prosperity than it has been in the past.

The problem of both Coastal and Inland transportation, which are of the first importance to the industrial welfare of the Colony, are receiving most careful consideration at the hands of my Ministers, who hope to be in a position to submit for consideration at this session of the Legislature some practical proposals for more efficient service.

Quite recently a company has been incorporated for the purpose of the erection of a large number of workingmen's homes. The company hopes that as many as thirty houses at a cost not exceeding $2,000 each will be constructed during the present year, and my Ministers anticipate that application will be made by the Company to the Legislature for certain concessions to assist them in their philanthropic activities.

I express the hope that your deliberations may, under the guidance of Divine Providence, tend to the further welfare and prosperity of this ancient Colony.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN: — Mr. Speaker, I move these Resolutions.

In moving these Resolutions I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that in them I am not making any charge of wrong-doing. It has been brought to the notice of the Government that certain irregularities have taken place and certain definite charges have been made against the Leader of the Government by an exMinister of the Crown and an ex-member of this House, and until that affidavit and these charges are closed up, I do not think it is out of place to move an adjournment and ask that the Leader of the Gevernment withdraw from this House until a proper enquiry establishes his innocence.

Let us go back to 1894. In that year charges were made against eighteen members of the House led by the late Sir William Whiteway Charges were laid against them in the Supreme Court of this Colony for bribery and corruption. What happened was that this House was called together and when theSupreme Court pronounced upon the first two cases tried before it, unseating two of its members, Messrs Moore and Woods, members for Bay de Verde District, the remaining members of that party refused to occupy their seats. That was right and proper, and according to moral law and usages they should not hold their seats in this House with a cloud hanging over them.

Today a similar thing has happened The Leader of this House has been charged with serious irregularities, as has already been stated. And this charge is not of yesterday or of a few days ago. It has been in existence for a month and it is up to the Leader of the Government now to rebut that charge now before a proper tribunal. Is it not the duty of members of this House, I ask, to satisfy themselves as to whether or not the Prime Minister is innocent and is it not only decent and right that we should adjourn this House so that the Commission appointed by the Government within the past forty-eight hours could take evidence and report to this House or to His Excellency the Governor. It has always been the practice and traditions of this House to jealously guard its independence, integrity and honesty. Why deviate from it now?

Ihave been a member of this House for twenty-eight years and during that period period charges were laid against me here. One man at present occupying a seat in this Chamber—I refer now to the Leader of the F.P.U.—made a charge against me. What happened My colleagues, one of whom is Prime Minister today, appointed a Commission over my head and without giving me notice, inquired into the charges. I kept clear of any executive meetings while that charge hung over my head until the Commission reported and vindicated me. Now what I am saying is perfectly correct, and in making this statement this evening ı hope that you gentlemen on the other side of the House will take action and see that justice is done to the Leader of the Government and to this House.

As previously mentioned by me, in '94 Sir William Whiteway, Sir Robert Bond, Sir Edward Morris, and fifteen others, members of the Government and of the House of Assembly, were unseated and disqualified for corrupt and illegal practices. That is now ancient history. Immediately the House was called together, an adjournment was taken to wait for the pronouncement of the Supreme Court where each and every case was tried. Sir William Whiteway could have come in here as you are today and gone on with the business of the House, but he took the position that a cloud hung

over the heads of eighteen members of his Government, including himself, and for that reason he was not prepared to come here to transact the business of the house or pass any legislation whatever.

I have presented a resolution that is right and proper. I am asking nothing which cannot be granted by the other side of the House. Nothing at all. When I present this resolution I am not blaming the Prime Minister, but I think it is right that we should await the result of the Commission. Why should we not leave this House until such time as there is an enquiry into this matter. Why should any legislation be passed while such a condition of affairs exists.

I think the Prime Minister ought to withdraw from the House, Sir, until this matter is cleared up. Why need any bills be passed? It is not necessary and we therefore ought to adjourn for one week. I can assure him, Sir, that as Leader of the Opposition and on their behalf that we will help the Government to pass all legislation that is necessary and beneficial for this Dominion. I think, Sir, that the Leader of the Government, the Prime Minister, ought not to come in here and keep his seat until such time that his innocence is established, and I serve notice that otherwise no business will go through this House. I make that stand on behalf of the Opposition. And I think this resolution ought to be shown every consideration and that before the result of the inquiry is known, nothing should be done. Why should the Prime Minister place himself in that position? We can leave the business of this House for the present. The Prime Minister ought to withdraw from this Chamber. All necessary legislation can be gone through when we come back to this Chamber. This is the position taken, Sir, and I have much pleasure, Sir, in moving this resolution.

MR. BENNETT:—In rising to second and support the resolution just submitted by the Leader of the Opposition, Sir Michael Cashin, I wish to avail of this early opportunity of extending my personal congratulations to you, Mr. Speaker, on the high honor that the House has conferred upon you, that of the highest Commoner in the land. You have been called therefor to fill a very important office, an office occupied by many able and eminent legislators, and I feel sure that the traditions that surround the Speaker's chair will be well maintained by you and that the impartiality that ever marked the office of your predecessors will still be continued and prove an incentive to you to follow in their footsteps.

The extraordinary circumstances at present existing in the House necessitate extraordinary procedure on His Majestys' loyal opposition.

The resolution just submitted is such as upon reflection, I feel sure that members on both sides of the House will consider most reasonable and desirable. It cannot be denied that at the present time the Leader of this House is in the unfortunate position that, until such time as he clears himself of the charges made against him through a sworn affidavit of an ex-Minister of the Crown, he can neither expect or deserve the confidence so essential to his office in the conduction of the business of this Assembly.

Mr. Squires stands charged with a serious offence and personally I regret to see him in that position and I feel that in order to absolutely vindicate his character and reputation he will agree to an adjournment of the House for a few days or until such time as the commission that is to be appointed can investigate and

report on such investigation. This enquiry should begin forthwith and continue until the matter is entirely cleared up. If the Prime Minister will agree to this and come back to the House vindicated and exonerated from any wrongdoing or misconduct I can assure him that at least some on this side of the House will extend a warm welcome to him, and facilitate him and the Government in every possible way to expedite the business of the session.

These resolutions are in keeping with resolutions that were presented to His Excellency the Governor a few days ago by the citizens of St. John's. These resolutions were passed at a large public meeting called together to consider the situation, and, as a representative of the citizens of St. John's, I protest against the holding of a spring election and certain papers made derogatory comments on their actions, and although those papers were supporting the Government of which I was a member, I then protested as I considered it was quite within the rights of the people to protest if they contended that the holding of an election in the spring would disfranchise a large proportion of the electorate. Subsequent events proved that they were right in their attitude as the spring election was abandoned and held at the usual time. This may have been the means of putting our friends on that side of the House and putting us over here. As we are content to abide by the will of the people and let right and justice prevail, a similar motion actuates us now. We have no desire to do an injustice to the Prime Minister, but we are as much concerned about the dignity and purity of his high office as he is, and are merely asking that he take such steps as are proper, either by adjourning the House for a few days or withdrawing himself, handing over the leadership for the time being to one of his associates, until he is vindicated and the cloud that hangs over him is passed away.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in seconding the Resolution proposed by the Leader of the Opposition and trust that the Prime Minister and honourable members on the other side of the House will see the desirability of accepting the same and put into effect such measure as will speedily clear up a situation that, as I said at the outset, was most extraordinary in the history of the Legislature of the Dominion.

MR. WALSH:—First, I must with the other members of the House congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on the high honor that has been conferred upon you, as the first from among the fishermen of the country to hold this high position. With regard to the resolution regarding the conduct of the Prime Minister I do not think that any lengthy speech is needed to convince the members of the House that the purpose of the resolution should be carried out. I want to assure the Honourable, the Leader of the Government, that I have no desire to injure him or any member of the Government. If this resolution is put into effect and he comes back vindicated by the commission I want to be one of the first to extend the hand of congratulation.

A serious blow is felt at the very foundation of the British constitution. I believe the Leader of the Government will welcome this resolution. The business of the country cannot be seriously interfered with for the short period that he may be absent from the House. I will give my support to every measure that is brought

forward that is for the benefit of the country. As I have said before, I do not think that it is necessary to make any lengthy observation, and I hope this House will, in its wisdom, accept this opportunity to vindicate the conduct of the Leader of the Government.

MR. MacDONNELL:—Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the members who have already spoken in congratulating you on the honor that has been conferred upon you. Regarding the resolution, certain matters should be taken into consideration. I have no personal animosity towards the Prime Minister. I think we should all make an attempt to drive all consideration of politics from this resolution. The resolution is directed at the office, rather than at the Prime Minister himself. I am of opinion that the Prime Minister himself will be glad that this resolution is introduced.

It may not be easy to consider the question in its abstract form, but it is in this way that it must be considered. The whole civilized world is in a state of unrest, and we shall not escape it through all time. When the unrest affects this country, it will be difficult enough to safeguard the interests of the people. This House should not consider any business until this matter is cleared up. Besides safeguarding the interests of the citizens we must also remember above everything else that the respect for the laws passed should be beyond reproach. A certain latitude is allowed to members of this House, but when a man comes into this House he comes into a place sanctified by the rights and privileges of a free people.

This resolution is directed to clear up a charge made against the Leader of the Government. I make no charge as to whether this is true or false. I want to warn this House that I will give no support to any legislation until this matter is cleared up.

Politically I fought the Prime Minister as vigorously as I knew how, but I can say with truth that I did it fairly, and I say with all sincerity that if he comes back to this Chamber vindicated and cleared of the charges now hanging over him, I shall be one of the first to welcome him. In the meantime I wish to place on record my contention that it is in the best interests of the Prime Minister himself that the resolution now before the chair should be carried.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Speaker, without wishing to take any prominent part in this debate I desire to say that the moving of these resolutions gives me an opportunity to make a statement with regard to part of the matter referred to which Ithink will be of interest to this Chamber and to the public generally. I do not think that any member of this House or anybody else for that matter, is unacquainted with the charges to which this resolution has reference, for anyone who has read the papers, or, perhaps, I should say, some of the papers, cannot be unaware of the details of the charges that have been brought against the Prime Minister. With these details I have nothing to do, but I will say that I for one am content to wait till the commission appointed to enquire into these charges has made known its findings before condemning those against whom the charges are made.

The Honourable Member for St. George's has spoken of the traditions of this House, and I agree with him that these traditions should be regarded as sacred by us. There is one which more than any other we should be careful to follow, and that is that a man should not be regarded as other

than innocent till he is proven guilty. I cannot see why the business of this House should be held up merely because it is the wish of some that this tradition be broken. I have no doubt that the Prime Minister will make a statement as to his position with regard to the charge of which we have heard so much, and meantime I content myself with making the statement to which I have already referred.

I have been called upon to put in motion the machinery of the law against the gentleman concerned in these charges and I have refrained from doing so because I am convinced that even if they were proven guilty of the action alleged against them there is nothing criminal in that action and therefore nothing of which I, as Attorney General, was called upon to take notice. I have moreover fortified myself with another opinion. I cabled the solicitor of the Government in London asking him to consult eminent legal authority on the point and his reply was that counsel advised that there was nothing criminal in the action charged against the Prime Minister, and consequently no foundation for any action by the Department of Justice.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:— Mr. Speaker, permit me first of all to extend to you, Sir, my hearty congratulations on your elevation to the distinguished rank of first commoner of the land. For many years the electoral District of Carbonear, for which you are now the sitting member, has been honored by having its representative occupying the Speaker's chair, and in congratulating you I am congratulating your constituency in that the honor which has been conferred upon you by the members of this House is an honor to the constituency which you represent.

I am particularly pleased that Sir Michael Patrick Cashin, the Leader of the Opposition, has given me the very earliest possible opportunity to refer to an affidavit which is now known throughout the length and breadth of the country as the St. Patrick's Day affidavit of William Woodford. The allegation made by Mr. Woodford that on St. Patrick's Day I entered into an agreement with him to purchase his resignation from the House of Assembly in consideration of a Government job, has been used by Sir Michael Cashin and his associates, William J. Higgins, one of Woodford's solicitors; William J. O'Neill, editor of The Plaindealer, and a number of their personal associates and friends for the purpose of personal vilification of myself, and during the past weeks bitter, false and offensive personal attacks have been made upon me by members of the Opposition and in the Opposition press.

These attacks have not, however, been more bitter, falser, more vindictive or abusive than has been the persistent personal campaign against myself by these men for months past. This vindictive personal pursuit is not unexpected to me. It is the sort of opposition which I must naturally expect from the class of people who have identified themselves with these attacks. These men were prepared to take any step, no matter how despicable, and to go to any lengths, no matter how dishonorable and disgusting, if perchance they could succeed in injuring myself as a public man, and as a citizen of the community.

Coming from the quarter from which these attacks come, I welcome them; coming from the minds and characters by which these attacks are produced, I also welcome them, and feel thankful that out of the party which it is my distinguished honor

to lead in this House. there is not one man who would condescend to reply in kind to attacks of such infamy and their friends; for weeks I have patiently submitted to the personal abuse of members of the Opposition and their friends; for weeks I have patiently submitted to the infamy and vindictive attacks of a scurrilous Opposition press, but finally the Opposition officially adopted the attack, associated themselves with the St. Patrick's Day affidavit to which I have referred, and forwarded officially a memorial, with copy of the affidavit attached, to His Excellency the Governor.

The memorial was to the effect that, "We, Sir Michael P. Cashin, William J. Higgins, William J. Walsh, Michael S. Sullivan, Nicholas J. Vinnicombe, Cyril J. Fox, James MacDonnell, Philip F. Moore, and Sir John Crosbie, have ever been free from trafficking in office, and being the custodians of public morality, demand that the entire public business of the Colony be delayed and that the Prime Minister be not permitted to open the Legislature because one of our associates, William Woodford, says that he sold himself politically to the Prime Minister for a Government job."

The names appended to that memorial are those of the gentlemen whom I have named. I gather that Mr. J. R. Bennett, Sir Michael Cashin's seconder on the motion now before the House, desires me to understand that he is in full accord with the memorial, and now formally identifies himself with it. Is that not so, Mr. Bennett?

MR. BENNETT:—Yes, it is.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Thank you.

I fully appreciate the political tactics of the Opposition in trying to draw me into a newspaper controversy with William Woodford. At such a spectacle they would feel the same malicious glee as if they could find me debating the straightness of a telegraph pole with a drinker of substitutes. I waited patiently until the official Opposition officially identified themselves with the action of their former colleague, Mr. Woodford. This they did by the memorial to which I have already referred. Immediately they took that step they brought the matter out of the realm of such observations as Messrs. Higgins and Howley, the solicitors for Mr. Woodford, might be pleased to make in the interests of their client; they took it out of the sphere of abusive political newspapers and put it upon the basis of a position officially adopted by the official Opposition for the purpose of a political attack upon myself as Prime Minister.

The fact of Mr. William Woodford's making a statement concerning me is a matter which I regard no more than the barking of some others. For that I have such remedy as the law of Newfoundland may give me through the courts, but the official adoption of the Woodford attack by the Opposition under the leadership of Sir Michael P. Cashin brought the matter into the realm of politics. I no longer felt that I was dealing personally with the attacks of a Woodford or a Cashin, but that I, as Prime Minister, was dealing with the official act of the official Opposition, and I at once asked His Excellency the Governor to consider the appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the whole circumstances, and a Royal Commission will be appointed. This will give the honorable members opposite further full opportunities of straining every nerve and resorting to every device to injure me as a

public man, as a professional man, and as a citizen.

I am very happy that Sir Michael Cashin has given me an opportunity of dealing with this at the earliest possible moment, but I am particularly happy that Sir Michael Cashin and his associates, constituting the entire Opposition, were pleased to identify themselves personally and as the official Opposition with this infamous political plot, which as a St. Patrick's Day affidavit attack upon myself will have no more effect upon myself personally nor upon the stability of this administration than the Guy Fawkes plot, memoralized on "Bonfire Day," November 5th, had upon the British Parliament.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Like my friend on this side of the House and my friends on the opposite side, I heartily concur with the congratulations tended you on the high honor which has been conferred upon you.

The Prime Minister stated in his address that the members on the Opposition side have been denouncing him for the last month or two. I can assure him that I have not gone out of my way to denounce him, and I am sure that there are several members on this side of the House who have not even mentioned his name.

We are forced to take this stand we have taken as what has happened is a reflection on the morality of the House. I sincerely trust that when this charge is investigated, the Prime Minister will be exonerated; it will be a great blow to this House if he is not exonerated. Mr. Warren told us that there is nothing criminal in the offence. He says he cabled across, and received a reply assuring him that there is nothing criminal in it. I think that the least he should do is to hand us this reply, which he received from the other side. I do not doubt Mr. Warren's word for a moment, but he should table the correspondence, so that he will know on what grounds the answer he received was received.

It is rather late now in the day for the Prime Minister to come out with such a statement. He has had a considerable while to think it over, and I doubt now if he would make a statement at all only he was forced to do so. He said every effort was being made by certain people and nothing would be stopped at to keep him from meeting this House as Prime Minister. I am at a loss to understand his insinuation and would be pleased if he would explain what he means.

The reason that I am supporting this resolution is because I believe in all sincerity that the members of this House will endorse this resolution which was carried at the public meeting the other night practically unanimously, and I that it should have been quite easy for the Prime Minister to have made a statement, when this happened first. If Mr. Squires is prepared to take an affidavit that there is nothing in this charge then I will be one of the first to say that he is welcome here, and I hope he will be here a long time.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE:—Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Leader of the Opposition in the resolution which he has moved for the adjournment of the House for one week. I also wish to take this opportunity of congratulating the Speaker upon the high honor conferred upon him, and personally I feel sure that the Speaker will so conduct himself in his position as to reflect credit upon himself and the House.

I regret exceedingly that the Prime Minister should take such an attitude toward the members on this side of the chair. I do not think it was

necessary for Mr. Squires to get off what he did this afternoon. I think Mr. Squires would have acquitted himself much better this afternoon if he had left unsaid a lot of things that he said. These charges have been in the air ever since the election.

Auditors were brought here from New York and Boston to prove charges against me. If I ever did anything wrong when I was a Minister of the Crown I did it without And in my innocence (and you know I am not very innocent), I would like to say to the Prime Minister "Let him who is without sin cast the first stone," and I don't think there are any stones around this House. I have been in this House when charges were made against members and things said in the heat of debate that were better unsaid. I am now occupying a chair that was once filled by a late Leader of the Opposition. He and I had many spats and crossed swords several times, but I will say this for him that while I was associated with him in the National Government I found him to be correct and above board. I found nothing wrong with him.

I feel that the leader of the F.P.U. will see that justice is done in this matter though the heavens may fall. I would like to say to the prime minister this afternoon that charges have been made in the Daily Star newspaper that could have been left out. I am manly enough to bring this matter up, not that I feel it; but rather because I should like for the prime minister to know it. Last night my head was likened to a billiard ball in the "Star." Now I do not think this is etiquette. I do not think that a man who is looking to keep up a high standard of politics and who hopes to get good clean government should tolerate this sort of thing. Now I am not going to be hypocritical, but the one who sets himself up to teach the man underneath him to do what is right is like a preacher and if he does not do what is right himself, he should expect to be judged by his own standards.

I really believe this afternoon that the prime minister is considering an adjournment of this house until Monday next. If either he or Mr. Coaker have anything to bring in that will be good for the colony I will support it, but if it turns out like the Fish Regulations I will oppose it. I would like for Mr. Squires to act squarely and manly in this matter before the chair. I do not ask him to get Mr. Warren or Mr. Coaker, to act in his place during his absence. When he has cleared himself of the Woodford charges I think he will stand on a higher pedestal in the eyes of his fellow-countrymen. I trust that Mr. Squires's explanation will be satisfactory to himself and that the Royal Commission gives their decision that he will be honorably acquitted. Personally I have nothing against any individual on any side of the house; I have nothing against the F.P.U. or any member thereof. You beat us last fall at the polls, but I was never beaten and I do not think that any Britisher yet was ever beaten. If I was going to be down and say I was beaten my fellow-countrymen would say I was no good. Messrs. Small and LeGrow would not be with us to-day if the British had to say they were beaten two, three or four years ago.

In concluding my remarks I appeal to my friend Mr. Coaker, leader of the F.P.U. and his associates and I appeal to you, Mr. Squires, to adjourn this house until Monday next. I ask you personally to quit this personal abuse as it is not good enough. It is all very well to circulate charges and stories for the purpose of exciting people, but when these stories are put in cold-blooded print, there is where you will

find the cure I appeal to you to try and get the papers to be more clean and wholesome and I will be one of the first to give you assistance.

I concur with the Resolutions moved by the leader of the opposition as I believe that they are right and decent and just as the citizens who appealed to His Excellency the Governor a few nights ago believed and I feel justified in again asking the prime minister to adjourn this house until Monday next.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Speaker, just a word or two and for obvious reasons I shall be careful to talk strictly on the principle involved in the resolutions. In fact what prompted me to talk at all is what our friend the prime minister said when he presented his forceful gaze on me and dubbed the affidavit of Mr. William Woodford the "St. Patrick's Day affidavit," and in view of the fact that I happened to be featured with a considerable amount of things pertaining to that day.

According to the spirit in which he has spoken regarding me there were apparent deliberate threats of imprisonment. He announced to the house that he welcomed that all this matter be enquired into thoroughly, so likewise, as a brother professional, do I approach this matter with a cleanliness of heart and a purity of purpose, as all the opposition want is "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth." I think that one will see upon reflection this evening that the manner in which these resolutions were introduced by the leader of the opposition, the manner in which they have been spoken to by those of our side, the matter of the resolutions themselves, and the temperament of the different speakers that there was an absence of any desire to be personal. There has been nothing at all unkind to the prime minister mentioned, whatever we may do in the future, perhaps, to save ourselves from going to the penitentiary or from being put upon the rack. There has been nothing said in the resolutions unkind about the prime minister, no charge or insinuation of any kind was made and the opposition are discussing them purely on principle as decent men should. Ithink that the prime minister will see that the resolutions presented by the leader of the opposition, not alone impute nothing or suggest nothing, but merely deal with the principle so well recognized in constitutional practice.

We ask that all business of the house be postponed until the commission appointed to investigate has had an opportunity to arrive at a decision. This is not a matter of party politics, no question as to who should make the motion, it is not question as to the exchange of personal reflections. What happened in the past may be right or it may be wrong. This is no place to discuss just now past history, or who should or should not be in the penitentiary. Many a man I have seen sent down to jail who did not get half the justice which many of us deserved. We are only mortals and do not pose to be anything more than ordinary men, and we are not expecting the prime minister to be anything more than an ordinary man. The members of the opposition however, you may find are not so green as you may expect them, or as they have been painted. What happened about the Lornina enquiry is easily dealt with. I may be able to tell a story about enquiries, and perhaps I shall some day. The Lornina enquiry started when Sir Michael Cashin was out of town, and it was only started because of his absence and for personal purposes. He was a strong man in politics and so could come back and see he got a fair trial. The enquiry proved his absolute innocence of the allegations made against him. The result revealed that some one was only trying to stab him in the back.

I take this opportunity of drawing the attention of the house to its duty to itself, and would ask the members on the other side of the house to keep secure its dignity and privilege. We will for our part see that the dignity and integrity of the house are carried out and respected. It is not a matter of merely pure party politics. If any members on the other side wish to vote against the motion, well, they are not upholding the traditions of this house. If they want to break these down by voting against this resolution, well it is their own business, but I fear they will some day regret it.

I should like to see the cable and the reply. I have a good opinion of the attorney general. He is too good a lawyer, and so is the premier himself, not to know that there are other aspects in the way or criminal law application to this country aside from the English election act. I merely suggest to the Honourable the Minister of Justice in the interests of the house to consider the resolution before the house and ought not the honourable the prime minister in consideration of this Resolution before the house and public opinion vacate his seat for the time being and not make himself unworthy of the position which he fills in this house. The prime minister as the leader of the house should set the example by doing what is right in matter of the privileges and honour of this chamber. It is not a matter of party interests, but is a matter for the consideration of the house as a house, because the rights of the house belong only to itself. We should not talk of the criminal laws. Parliament is beyond and above the laws. What could have happened if no Royal Commission had been appointed to investigate the misconduct of the prime minister stands accused of? The prime minister would come in here and debate this matter under privilege. Yes, I might sincerely say to the prime minister if there was no commission to deal with the matter I believe he himself would move the house into privilege for the consideration of this matter.

I respectfully and sincerely submit that the resolution does not discredit the leader of the house, nor does it suggest anything underhand, it merely asks that the business of this house be deferred, and for that reason I think the motion is worthy of being carried whether it came from the other side or not and in that case I should and shall support in and even if it concerned the leader of the Opposition.

Whereupon the House divided and these appeared for the resolution:—Sir M. P. Cashin, Sir J. C. Crosbie, Messrs. Bennett, Higgins, Fox, Vinnicombe, Dr. Jones, Mr. Moore, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Sinnott, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. MacDonnell—(12); and against it—Prime Minister, Minister of Justice, Minister of Finance, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Minster of Education, Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, Hon. Mr. Foote, Minister of Public Works, Acting Minister of Shipping, Mr. LeGrow, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Small, Mr. Cheeseman, Mr. Hibbs, Mr. Gosse, Mr. Archibald, Mr. Scammell, Mr. Targett, Mr. Guppy, Mr. Jones, Mr. Samson—(22); so it passed the the negative and was ordered accordingly.

Mr. Speaker further announced that whilst in the Council Chamber His Excellency had been pleased to make a speech to both branches.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted at this stage of the proceedings to occupy the attention of the House for a moment with the consideration of a resolution of sympathy to the relatives of the three deceased gentlemen who since last session have vacated their seat in the Legislative Council of Newfound-

land to undertake the activities of the broader and fuller life for which many of us conceive this life to be but a training school.

In January last the Hon. Dr. Skelton passed away at the age of 93 years. He was a Bonavista lad and had the advantage of a professional training which in his student days was regarded splendid. He returned to Bonavista and practised there for some considerable time. He afterwards moved to Greenspond, where he practised for some years. When only forty-nine years of age he retired from active practice, his reason being that he was not physically able to undertake the arduous work of a medical practitioner in an outport. In spite, however, of physical frailities of the forties he was active, both mentally and physically, up to January last, at the age of 93. Dr. Skelton was a representative in the Newfoundland Legislature for the District of Bonavista for two terms, and for the District of Fogo for one term. In his younger days he was regarded as a surgeon of very high repute. He was a prominent member of the Church of England denomination and a citizen who has left a life record of long and faithful service.

The Hon. A. F. Goodridge, who was at one time Prime Minister of Newfoundland, has also vacated his seat in the Legislative Council. Mr. Goodridge was a Devonshire man and a gentleman. He came to Newfoundland when about fourteen years of age and entered the establishment of his father at Renews, in the District of Ferryland. In 1880 he was elected representative for Ferryland in the House of Assembly, and again in 1882, on both occasions being elected without opposition. During 1884 he was the Leader of the Opposition. In '85 he contested the electoral District of Twillingate, and for four years thereafter was a member of the Executive administration of the day. In 1889 he was defeated. From 1890 to 1893 he was not actively engaged in public affairs. In 1893 he was again elected for the District of Twillingate. On the resignation of the Whiteway administration of '94, he was called upon to form a cabinet, which he did, and for some time was Prime Minister. His appointment to the Legislative Council dates from the year 1913. In spite of his maturity of years he showed an active interest in public affairs, and frequently took part in the debates of the Council. Mr. Goodridge gave one noble boy as his family's offering on the altar of liberty during the late war. His son, Mr. R. F. Goodridge, is the popular well-known Lieutenant-Colonel of the Church Lads' Brigade, and Mr. Fred Goodridge is manager of the Goodridge business at Ferryland. Mr. Wm. Goodridge, another son, is a manager of the Goodridge firm, St. John's.

These two senior members of the Legislative Council, Hon. Dr. Skelton, and Hon. A. F. Goodridge, passed out of life, having as public-spirited citizens given their many years of life's effort to the upbuilding of the industrial, commercial and professional interests, and social welfare of the community. They leave behind them sorrowing friends and acquaintances, but there is not poignant sorrow at the departure of two elderly gentlemen who have lived long lives and pass out in due course of time, having each passed the eightieth milestone in life's journey as we human beings count time. All the friends and acquaintances of their early days had gone before them.

"The mossy marbles rest
On the lips that they had pressed
In their bloom;
And the names they loved to hear
Have been carved for many a year
On the tomb."

Not so, however, was the case of the Hon. John Harvey, who in the fullness of life's activities was called from the Legislative Council chamber and his large business interests, his many social and philanthropic activities, to other fields of labor. In his departure we all feel the cutting short ere its time of a noble life.

"Yet once more, O ye laurels, and once more,
Ye myrtles brown, with ivy never sere,
I come, to pluck your berries harsh and crude;
And, with forced fingers rude,
Shatter your leaves before the mellowing year."

In the case of the Hon. Dr. Skelton and the Hon. A. F. Goodridge, the mellowing year had come and almost passed. In the case of the Hon. John Harvey, his earthly life ceased before full fruition. As a prominent member of the firm of Messrs. Harvey & Co., the Hon. John Harvey was vitally interested in the commerce of the Colony. As a business man he was successful, and the firm of which he was the senior member has the highest reputation for honour and efficiency in business matters. In spite of the pressure of his business responsibilities Mr. Harvey was ever ready to devote time and effort to public and philanthropic matters. His work in connection with the campaign against the ravages of tuberculosis which extended from the year 1907 to the year 1913, when the work was taken over by the Government, is a memorial to the self-sacrificing industry of this public-spirited gentleman. It is generally understood that the summer training school for teachers could not have become an accomplished fact had it not been for the large private donations of Mr. Harvey. During the war he was ever ready with any effort which lay within his power in the interests of Newfoundland reciting, and the first Newfoundlander to lay down his life for the Empire was the Hon. John Harvey's bother, Bernard, who was a commander in the Royal Navy. The passing of Mr. Harvey means a loss to Newfoundland of a citizen who easily bore his own large burdens as an outstanding business man in the community and a man who was ever ready to help to bear the burdens of others also.

These three legislative councillors stand out as an object lesson of faithful service. In the case of the Hon. Dr. Skelton and Hon. Mr. Goodridge there was fullness of life rounded out by a plenitude of years; in the Hon. Mr. Harvey an intensity of life cut short at early maturity.

"Now the laborer's task is o'er;
Now the battle-day is past;
Now upon the farther shore
Lands the voyager at last.

"There the tears of life are dried;
There its hidden things are clear;
There the work of life is tried
By a juster Judge than here.

"Father, in Thy gracious keeping,
Leave we now Thy servant sleeping."

I move, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution do now pass:

RESOLVED—That this house desires to record the expression of its deep regret at the death of the Honorable George Skelton, the Honorable Augustus F. Goodridge and the Honorable John Harvey; sometime members of the Honorable Legislative Council.

RESOLVED—That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the relatives of the deceased honorable gentlemen.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Mr. Speaker, I join with the leader of the government in the motion of con-

dolence before the chair. Dr. Skelton lived a life of usefulness, and did noble work in the interest of Newfoundland. He was an active figure in all public matters. In the legislature he was always first in his place, and always last to leave the place. I often discussed with him mornings when we met of the conditions of his health and congratulated him on his remarkable vitality. He was one of the old land marks who did his duty quietly, fearlessly, and without ostentation. He was unassuming but earnest in his political duties as he was kind and courteous in his private life. A gentleman of the old school who bore no ill-feeling, who by his example and conduct strove to make things run smoothly and to appease bitterness and strife. We shall meet him no more here, but we can feel with an assurance strengthened by our strong faith in Divine justice, that he is now enjoying the reward of a well spent life and the happiness which is due to one who in this life bent his energies and exercised his will to make our conduct harmonize with what is good, generous, and charitable.

Next to him who has passed to the great beyond since this legislature last met, is the Hon. A. F. Goodridge, who was known to me better than any honourable member of this house. He came to Ferryland district 67 years ago to engage in the fishery business under the tuition of his father. He grew up in Ferryland and he trained in the business of the fishery there and his name in the district was ever an honored one, and his memory will long be cherished in the hearts of the people. The Goodridge firm, as you all well know, was one of the foremost, if not the foremost, of the business houses in Newfoundland, and it occupied that place because of the industry and integrity of its members, and the Hon. A. F. Goodridge was loved in the district of Ferryland and esteemed beyond the ordinary man. True the Goodridge firm made money in Ferryland as they did elsewhere, but it was ever their aim to deal fairly and generously with all; and I venture to say, sir, that when the announcement of Hon. A. F. Goodridge's death was made there were more prayers offered for him in that district than in any other part of the country. The proof of the high place which he held in the esteem of the people amongst whom he labored, is to be found in the fact that when he stood as a candidate for Ferryland district he was unanimously elected to this assembly without any opposition whatever, and I now make the statement without fear of successful contradiction that had he desired to remain the representative of that district up to the time of his death, he could have done so. An outstanding characteristic of the Goodridges was that they never saw a poor man go without assistance, and it was never known of them to turn a man away unprovided for. If, as it often happened, they were forced to cease doing business with anyone because he had got on the wrong side of the books, they sent for him and gave him the wherewithal to carry him through the winter, and it is with the deepest regret for his death that I second these resolutions. though we must not forget that his life was run. He was four score years of age, but he stuck to his business to the very last. He was not the kind that rusted out, but rather was he one who, in the truest sense, wore out, and he was just as anxious to further the business interests of the country at the last as he was in the days of his greatest activity.

And now sir, I come to the third of these honored men whom death has removed from the upper chamber, the Hon. John Harvey. I did not have as close relations with the Hon. Mr. Harvey as I did with Mr. Goodridge, but I

knew him sufficiently well to know that there was no more respected man in this country than he was, and many homes are the poorer for his passing. To help was one of his weaknesses, and I say weadnesses advisedly because in not a few cases the help which he so freely gave was abused. I look upon Mr. Harvey as a national loss, for it was his object to advance every interest of the colony, and for that reason, as well as for others equally obvious, his death came as a shock to every one who knew him.

In rising, Mr. Speaker, to second these resolutions I do so, I think I may say, as one who has more experience than any other member of this chamber, and in my time of twenty-eight years there has not been an occasion when this house met but the leader of the government had to rise in his place and submit resolutions of condolence on the death of some honorable member of either one or the other branches of the legislature. It was only a few days ago that I had occasion to look up some old records, and I found there that no less than seventy-seven members have passed away since I first entered this house. After all, in spite of the excitement of political strife, we have to come here and consider resolutions of this kind. There is no member within sound of my voice who was here when I first came here. I am the oldest sitting member to-day, and I was the youngest sitting member when I first took my seat in the assembly. I second these resolutions with the greatest sincerity, and in doing so I would ask the house, and I consider it fitting that they should do so, to rise while I repeat the De Profundus for the repose of the souls of those honorable gentlemen who have gone before.

De Profundis clamavi ad te Domine,
exaudi vocem meam.
Fiant aures tuae intendentes in vocem deprecationis meae
Si iniquitates observaveris, Domine; Domine, quis susinebit?
Quia apud te propitiatia esta; et propter legem tuam sustinui te, Domine.
Sustinuit anima mea in verbo ejus; speravit anima mea in Domino.
A custodia matutina usquo ad noctem speret Israel in Domino.
Quia apud Dominum misericordia: et copiosa apud eum redemptio.
Eet ipse redimet Israel ex omnibus iniquitatibus ejus.
Requiem aeternam dona eis, Domine.
Et lux perpetua luceat eis.
A porta inferi.
Erue, Domine, animas corum.
Requiescant in pace. Amen.

MR. SMALL:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that a committee be appointed to draft an Address in Reply to the gracious Speech with which His Excellency has been pleased to open the present session of the Legislature.

His Excellency most appropriately opens his speech by reference to the great world war and the satisfaction which Great Britain and her allies naturally feel because of its glorious termination. Every great war has an aftermath of unrest. It is gratifying to every student of history to note that the world disturbance in matters of business, finance and general conditions are comparatively insignificant today, as compared with the turmoil which followed previous great wars.

The strength of the race which we call British has been displayed, and the loyal enthusiasm of Britishers, scattered though they may have been to the four corners of the world, throbbed in response to the Empire's call for heroic sacrifices. The strength of our Empire is not found in its

territory, vast as that is, not on the number of its peoples, enormous as that is, but rather in the sturdy character of the men who call themselves Britishers. Great Britain has given to the world great men and great institutions, and the homeland as a monarchy is more democratic in the actual working out of its policy for public uplift, than many of the states who describe their form of government in more democratic language.

I have the privilege of having associated with me as the seconder of this motion Mr. F. P. LeGrow, one of the members for the District of Bay de Verde. Mr. LeGrow and I were two of the first five hundred Newfoundlanders who volunteered in response to the call to arms, and gives me, as I am sure it also gives him, very great pleasure today to be identified with the governing part of the Colony for which we fought and from whose shores we sailed on the fourth day of October, 1914, to take our part on behalf of our homeland and Empire in the fight against the foreign foe.

The war has destroyed many of the fossilized ideas of past centuries, and as a result of it the world has been forced to embark upon an era of reorganization and reconstruction. I am satisfied that the government of which I am a member is firm in its resolve to undertake a reorganization of Newfoundland conditions.

It will be noted that His Excellency states that it is the intention of the government to bring before the House a bill for the creation of a Department of Posts and Telegraphs. Newfoundland is years behind the times in its postal and telegraph system. Party politics has during recent years played such a prominent part in the appointment of officials that good service and efficiency has often been sacrificed, and it is my hope as one of the younger members of the government to see this remedied. In the acting Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, Mr. Halfyard, the government has made a wise selection. Mr. Halfyard has an intimate knowledge of Newfoundland affairs, and has had some considerable training in public life. He brings to his office energy and the spirit for efficient reorganization and good management.

The creation of a Department of Education is also referred to in the Speech from the Throne. Those of us who were members of the Royal Newfoundland Royal Naval Reserve realize the difficulties which we Newfoundlanders had to face because of the backwardness of our educational facilities. The creation of a Department of Education is the putting in the keystone in the educational arch of today, and will I am sure render efficient the educational system which has already accomplished so much for Newfoundland in spite of the paucity of its grants and the scattered nature of our population. Dr. Arthur Barnes, who holds the portfolio of acting minister of education, has for years been an educationist. For some time a teacher he has the practical knowledge necessary for such an important post. With Dr. Barnes' experience, special knowledge and ability, I feel sure that a new energy will be put into our educational work.

Reference is also made in the speech to the reorganization of the agricultural department. For many years past the Department of Agriculture and Mines has been of importance only in that it has absorbed large amounts of public moneys. There has been no constructive ability directed to the department; money has been spent more on the basis of political expediency than with regard to the efficient administration of an agricultural department. True it is that Newfound-

land can never be expected to be a great agricultural country; a very large portion of its soil is unsuited to agricultural pursuits! the climate of many sections of the country is also adverse, but it is a crying shame that Newfoundland should have to import from the nearby provinces of Canada the ordinary vegetables, which grow so wonderfully in the soil of all sections of the country. I feel confident that under the guidance of Dr. Alexander Campbell, who is himself an agricultural enthusiast, the Department of Agriculture will be greatly improved.

The Department of Public Works is being reorganized, and an effort is being made to put the matter of government contracts upon a business-like basis. Graft is eliminated from the program of the new administration. Some people undoubtedly regard the new government as a stingy government, but the people of the country who pay the bills will appreciate honest, earnest effort on behalf of the Department of Public Works to secure reasonable value for money expended.

The Department of Marine and Fish eries has at its head one who has achieved great success as an organizer of the fishermen of the country and as head of an important fishermen's co-operative enterprise. Mr. Coaker has the confidence of the fishermen of the North particularly, and though I am not a fisherman yet I am satisfied that measures will be brought forward by the Government on his recommendation as Minister of Marine and Fisheries for the improvement of the working out of matters in connection with his Department, the development of our fisheries, the standardization of the cull and the improvement of the cure. The appointment of trade agents in Newfoundland's principal foreign fish markets will be measures of incalculable benefit to this our stable industry.

I am proud of the opportunity which has been given me of moving that this committee be appointed; I am proud of the opportunity which the electorate has given me of identifying myself with the government party, feeling confident as I do that the Prime Minister and those who are his associates in the council chamber have one ambition and one ambition only, and that is to serve our Island Home honestly, honourably and to the best of their ability as statesmen. I take this opportunity to congratulate you on the great honor conferred on you. I beg, Mr. Speaker, to move that this committee be appointed.

SERGT. F. LeGROW—Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of seconding the motion so ably put before the House by the Hon. and gallant Member for Burgeo—Lieut. Small. I am sure the House has listened with a great deal of attention to the splendid speech with which Mr. Small has made.

I would first of all take this opportunity to extend to you, Mr. Speaker, my sincere congratulations on the high honor which has been conferred upon you. I feel sure, Sir, you will uphold the honor and dignity of the high position you now hold and that the best traditions of the House will be safeguarded by you in your discharge of your high official duties.

The country will, I feel sure, be pleased to learn from the Speech from the Throne that the Government, on the representation of the Prime Minister, has succeeded in securing from the British Government three ships, a full description of which has already been published in the city press. One of these steamers is a sloop of considerable merit and will no doubt be used by

the Department of Marine and Fisheries in the interests of our fisherfolk. The need of such a ship has been felt for years. The fishermen making St. John's in the fall of the year have experienced very many dangers which, we hope, will now be reduced to a minimum by the use of this steamer. Just what the exact nature of the work she will be employed in I am not in a position to say. I hope the Government will be able to see its way clear to have the vessel employed as a tug boat and salving ship for rescue work around the coast. Had we such a vessel here in years gone by, many a one now missing would today be with us.

The general trade of the Colony will, I fell sure, appreciate the efforts of the Government in the business-like manner in which it has handled our coastwise transportation problem. The service has grown so of late years that the present two steamers, "Portia" and "Prospero," are inadequate to cope with the demands. The purchase of new steamers for these routes will greatly facilitate trade matters, and as far as the western section of the Colony is concerned, will I hope be the means of our getting a large share of that trade which today goes to Canadian ports by reason of the shipping facilities afforded by Canadian steamers plying on that coast. Newfoundland is inthe making, and the efforts of the Government to improve transportation is one, Sir, that I am sure will have the heartiest support of all sections of the Colony.

In connection with this matter I sincerely hope the Government will be able to improve shipping matters. It is a great annoyance and unnecessary expense to both the trade and the consignees at present. Teams laden with freight for Northern and Western ports are delayed hours and in some cases a whole day, awaiting their turn to the coastal wharf. No fault can be found with Messrs. Bowring Bros. They are doing, and I think it will be readily admitted, have always done their best in this connection. The same can be said of the officials of the Newfoundland Produce Co. I hope, Sir, ways and means will be devised whereby a quicker and better service will be given the trade in the matter of shipping goods by our coastal steamers.

As one who represents a fishing constituency, I feel it my duty to congratulate the Government on the manner in which it grappled with and handled our staple industry immediately on its assumption to power. The fisheries of this Colony will for years to come, maybe for ever, be the main staple export of Newfoundland, and anything the Government can do to improve both the cure and the marketing of our fish, should receive the heartiest and sincere co-operation of all those who have the best interests of our people and common country at heart.

I will admit a great deal of misunderstanding was caused when the Government's new fish regulations were first promulgated, but I think it will be admitted by even the bitterest enemies of these regulations that Newfoundland has gained a good deal from them, and in this respect I submit, Sir, that a deal of credit is due to the good work done on behalf of the Colony and the great interest taken in the welfare of our fishermen by the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. These regulations have given Newfoundland fisheries a good and new name in the European markets. They have been the means of bringing more forcibly to the notice of our foreign buyers that Newfoundland is determined to improve her cure of codfish and that in the future

those who buy our fishery products will get the best value for the money they pay.

We have both heard and read quite a lot about the Italian Consorzio and the alleged Hawés-Coaker combine. I take it, Sir, that there are not a hundred intelligent persons in Newfoundland who ever took seriously the claims of those who for purely partisan political purposes were prepared to jeopardize the fishing industry of this Colony. I have had faith in these regulations from the first, and I am firmly convinced that in the very near future the wisdom of the Government's action in the matter will be so apparent to all that there will be no room whatever for even a difference of opinion as to their usefulness, not to speak of the benefits that will accrue to Newfoundland and her hardy sons who wrest from the bosom of the Atlantic the cod that makes this country self-supporting.

Party politics have played a big part in these regulations. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries asked for unity from all in what he and his fishery advisory board thought would be for the general good of the country, but he was forced to face unnecessary abuse and a deal of ridicule in doing his duty.

At the time these regulations were put in force the foreign markets were in a bad shape financially as a result of the war. Financial credits were in a tangled skein, and it required boldness, courage and faithfulness of purpose to meet the situation. The Government met all three and did its duty to the country, and I feel sure the fishermen who lives by the fisheries will appreciate and give due credit to the Prime Minister and his party associates for their work in their behalf.

There is another paragraph in the Speech from the Throne to which I would refer, and that is the provision for the construction of workingmen's houses. We will all admit that there never was such a pressing need for houses as there is to-day. The world over governments are confronted with the same difficulty. In England there is a countrywide movement on foot to cope with the situation. Municipal and state authorities are taking the matter up and the people themselves are helping in every way to improve the present deplorable conditions that exist. Here in our own city Hon. John Anderson, assisted by Hon. M. P. Gibbs and Mr. Jas. McGrath, until recently President of the L. S. P. U., have done yeomen work in this particular, and the people of St. John's will be pleased to observe in the Speech from the Throne that the newly incorporated company are pushing ahead in this matter and that they hope to construct 30 houses this year.

This is a matter that deserves the closest attention of this legislature and I am pleased to observe that the government anticipate being able to assist the company in their laudable undertaking.

The conditions under which a large portion of our city laborers are living is indeed appalling and nothing should be left undone by the government and the citizens generally to help in the improving of present conditions.

The new company is one which should command the respect and confidence of all investors and I am sure that the investing public will, when the call is made, be only too willing to invest in such a proposition. The government may not be able to do all that it may be asked to do in this matter, but it is pleasing to learn from his excellency's speech that the matter is being recognized and that the government is prepared to deal

with the question. The question is a big one, and for that reason deserves to be handled in a national spirit.

The present day living conditions are none too pleasant for many famlies. Houses are at a premium and whilst the preposed erection of 30 new dwellings will not altogether fill the want, it will be encouragement to the public to know that the matter is being dealth with on sound safe lines and that an honest attempt is being made to improve this pressing necesssity.

I feel sure that the city residents will apreciate the manner in which this matter is being dealt with by the Government, and I also feel sure that all will co-operate with the Dominion Building Association in their great undertaking.

We owe it to the younger generation of today to provide them with comforts of a decent home, and we owe it to the wage-earner to see that he gets the opportunity to give his family a decent, comfortable home. The home is the cradle of the country and whatever is done for the younger generation is the country's gain in the future.

And now, Mr. Speaker, allow me to refer to that paragraph in His Excellency's speech which touches the heart of the country. I refer to the heroic part of Newfoundland's sons in the world war. Having served in the ranks myself, and having fought on the field of battle, I may be pardoned in speaking of the matter to some extent. I am mindful that Lieut. Small, Lieut.-Col. Sullivan and myself are the first soldier representatives to sit in the Newfoundland Legislature, and I regard it as a great personal honor to be privileged to second that motion so ably moved by my soldier comrade. We have seen the sorrowful and the humorous side of the war. We have seen men fall before us, and we have faced death as did many a brave fellow in that fight for which millions gave their lives. We stand today, soldier representatives in the Newfoundland House of Assembly, and I trust that in the years to come those who regard us as their spokesmen in their claims for recognition will be able to say that we have fulfilled our duty both to the living and to the dead.

The members of the Honourable House of Assembly, in common with the people of Newfoundland, will be gratified to learn that the Dominion has acquired the site of Beaumont Hamel—the battlefield where our Regiment won imperishable fame on July 1st, 1916. It is, perhaps, a great privilege, as one who has served with them in their bright moments and dark hours to pay tribute to the excellent esprit de corps which was characteristic of our brothers in arms overseas.

"None shall eclipse them;
The day grows old, but with the setting of the sun
New visions arise;
They were our brothers;
Britons all they lived until they died."

The most glorious dream of our Canadian cousins was that some day —when the war guns had been silenced and the sun had risen on a peaceful world—they would erect on the indulating ground of Vimy and Messines, and on the far-flung areas of their battlefront suitable memorials to their gallant dead. How much more inspiring — how much more thrilling—is the realization of our dream—the purchase by Newfoundland of the very ground where our men advanced and paid the price of Empire, leaving behind a place sanc-

tified and hallowed by the young blood of Great Britain's oldest possession. Today many of our noblest and best sleep quietly in the silent places where the scarlet poppies grow in rich profusion—to their sacred memory the purchase of the site of Beaumont Hamel is the graceful tribute of a grateful country.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I think I could not do better than quote the words of the immortal Lincoln in his never-to-be-forgotten Gettysburg speech. We have secured Beaumont Hamel as a last resting place for those who gave their lives that the nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this. But in a larger sense we cannot dedicate, we cannot consecrate, we cannot hallow this ground. The brave men living and dead who struggled there, have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note or long remember what we do here; but it can never forget what they did. It is for us the living, rather, to dedicate here to the unfinished work which they who fought for have so nobly advanced.

It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us, that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave that last full measure of devotion; and that we highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain, and that this country, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom; and that a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from the earth.

I think, Sir, I have covered the most important parts contained in the Speech from the Throne, and have therefore much pleasure in seconding the motion so ably and logically moved by Lieut. Small, that a select committee be appointed by this House to draft a reply to the Speech from the Throne, with which His Excellency has been pleased to open this first session of the 24th General Assembly of the Newfoundland Legislature.

It was moved by Mr. Small and seconded by Mr. LeGrow that an address of thanks be presented to his excellency the governor, in reply to the gracious speech with which he had been pleased to open the present session of the legislature, and that a select committee be appointed to adopt such address in reply, the committee to consist of Mr. Small, Mr. LeGrow, Hon. Minister of Justice, Mr. Fox and Mr. Sullivan.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—I rise for the purpose of congratulating the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech. As has been stated they are the first of the soldier representatives in the House of Assembly. I congratulate them on the manner in which they have praised the Speech from the Throne. Mr. Speaker, out of respect for those two gentlemen, I have decided to reserve my remarks till the next sitting of the House. Both these gentlemen are Blue Puttee men; both those are two of the first who rallied to the call in 1914. I remember quite well the day they left on the ill-fated Florizel. I was one of the members of the Government, and when that call came Newfoundland wasn't in the position financially that she is in today. It seemed impossible, I may tell you, to the government of the day, that five hundred men could be rallied from Newfoundland, to go and fight our unteered in the first of the war than we can ever repay. All that the battles. Some went at it diligently, not with much hope, but what do they find? Men like the mover and seconder rallied to the call. They were the

men who led the way, and that is the reason I reserve my remarks till the next sitting of this House. I have much pleasure in congratulating the mover and seconder.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, I desire to join with the Leader of the Opposition in congratulating the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech. It is with more than mere formal courtesy. We owe a great deal more to those who vol- Board of Pensions and Civil Re-Establishment Committee can do is not too much for the boys who took their chance in face of fearful odds, to do honor to the Empire.

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that on tomorrow he would ask leave to introduce a bill entitled: "An Act respecting the effect and application of certain Acts subsequent to Consolidated Statutes (Third Series)."

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that on tomorrow he would ask leave to introduce a bill entitled. "An Act to amend the Industrial Societies Act, 1919."

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that on tomorrow he would ask leave to introduce a bill entitled: "An Act to amend Cap. 41 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled: 'Of the Newfoundland Medical Board.' "

Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave notice that on tomorrow he would ask leave to introduce a bill entitled: "An Act to provide for the Standardization of Codfish."

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that on tomorrow he would ask leave to introduce a bill entitled: "An Act to amend the Food Control Act, 1917."

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that on tomorrow he would ask leave to introduce a bill entitled: "An Act respecting the Department of Public Works."

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that on tomorrow he would ask leave to introduce a bill entitled: "An Act respecting the Department of Posts and Telegraphs."

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Sir J. C. Crosbie gave Notice of Question.

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled the following documents:

Report of Newfoundland Savings Bank, 1919.

Report of Harbor Grace Industrial Society, 1919.

Report of Newfoundland War Contingent Association.

Report of Department of Militia up to March 31st, 1919.

Thanks of House of Lords and Commons for the services of Newfoundland Soldiers and Sailors in the Great War.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, April 22, 1920.

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

MR. SULLIVAN:—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from several of the inhabitants of Rushoon, Placentia Bay, asking that that place be made a port of call of the s.s. Argyle. Those people over there are laboring under great disadvantages; and while I am on this matter I would like to ask my hon. friend, Mr. Foote, member for Burin, to support this petition, as Rushoon divides the two districts in two, and it would be a great benefit to his district as well as to the District of Placentia and

St. Mary's. Under present conditions the people of Rushoon have to go to Oderin and Flat Island for freight and it is a great hardship in winter time. The same applies regarding the mail. People have to travel to Baine Harbor and probably have to wait there for hours, and besides, it is difficult to get a place to stay.

I am sure that the Hon. Mr. Foote will be very pleased to support my colleagues and myself in having this matter attended to. It only means a delay of half an hour to have the Argyle call at Rushoon. I have great pleasure in presenting this petition, and ask that it be passed over to the department to which it relates.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Speaker, I have very great pleasure in giving my unqualified support to this very reasonable request coming from the people of Rushoon. Rushoon has the unique distinction, if I may use the word, at the present moment, of being represented by five members of this House, by the Hons. Messrs. Foote and Cheeseman, members for Burin as well as by the representatives for Placentia and St. Mary's. This very reasonable request coming before the House, therefore, I am sure, and in fact I have every confidence will be granted.

I may say that coastal facilities generally on the West Coast, not only on the west side of Placentia Bay, but right in the bay and up to Burin District, are very unsatisfactory. This matter of coastal service has frequently come before the House in previous years and I feel that with one steamer plying on Placentia Bay that it is utterly impossible to improve the service. We should not have to wait for the next session of this Legislature to have this matter adjusted. Each and every member of any side should combine and throw party politics to the wind and try to inaugurate a service giving these people what they request. Every member of this House who has had occasion to travel knows that practically the same condition of affairs exists in other districts. The only way we can overcome this great obstacle is by giving the people better and more adequate coastal service and this can only be done by putting an extra steamer in Placentia Bay. There are a number of places in Placentia Bay where the people have no communication with the outside world at all. The people are so situated that they are absolutely isolated and the main reason is because the Argyle is called upon to do more work than she can perform.

Now I hope that the Government will give this matter their serious consideration, not as in the past when petitioners asked for a resonable request refer the matter to the department of the government to which it related and neglect to give it any further attention.

MR. SINNOTT:—I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition presented by my colleague.

HON. MR. FOOTE:—It affords me great pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition presented by the hon. member for Placentia and St. Mary's, Mr. Walsh. The coastal service generally requires a thorough improvement and the incoming Government intends making improvements, and I am sure will take the coastal service proposition in hand and give it the attention it so deservedly requires. The Government will make improvements around that part of the coast touching the District of Placentia Bay. I have approached the Government on the matter and they will give it the serious and careful consideration that it requires. As I have said, it has contemplated making improvements to

the coastal service during the coming year.

MR. CHEESEMAN:—I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition and endorse all that has been said about it. As Mr. Walsh has said it is utterly impossible for one boat to give satisfactory service in Placentia Bay. On this section of the coast, business is very great and demands greater attention in the steamship service. I shall sincerely do all in my power to have this done and believe the Government will do something and do it properly to bring about a better state of affairs in the steamship service of Placentia Bay. There is no bay in the country whose needs are more pressing than this one and I sincerely trust that before long there will be more than one boat plying in Placentia Bay.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present petition which has been presented to me from the inhabitants of Haystack, Placentia Bay. This House, no doubt, is fully aware that in last November, terrific storms swept this part of the bay, and from the storm of the 9th of November past the people of Haystack suffered considerably. This place is built on a flat piece of land which is a narrow neck and from the above storm great havoc resulted to the people of this settlement. The petition is signed by thirty-five electors and they ask that a breakwater be built so that any grea damage in the future will be prevented. Should any great storm take place it is likely that several houses will be washed away. Considering the great damage that the petitioners have suffered I think that something should be done. They ask for the sum of five thousand dollars to build this breakwater. Owing to the gravity and the g rave nature of the damage that may occur at any time, I think it is advisable to send out the outport inspector or the Government Engineer to Haystack and make a report on this matter. I trust that the Government will see its way clear to meet the prayer of this petition after receiving the report of the engineer or the ma n whom they may send. I have much pleasure, therefore, Mr. Speaker, in giving this petition my hearty support.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I beg leave, Mr. Speaker, to present a petition from the Women's Patriotic Association of Newfoundland. I think there could not be anything more important to this House than a petition from the executive body of this association. The hon. member for Placentia, Mr. Walsh, in presenting the petition from the people of Rushoon said that the petitioners occupied the unique position of having five representatives in this House, and that the petition ought to have their support, and in the same way I feel sure that every member of the House will support this petition and particularly the three honorable gentlemen of His Majesty's forces which are represented here. The petition prays that an act be passed incorporating the association, and this is asked because the liberality and generosity of the people of Newfoundland has enabled them to have a surplus of money on their hands left over from their patriotic exertions. They desire that they be able to devote the same to some purpose. The women of Newfoundland through their executive committee, decided to ask this House to pass an act incorporating the association, so that they will be at liberty to spend the money in any way they desire. I may say to the honorable members of the House that this is a little out of the ordinary, and so that the members may understand what is asked I will read the first paragraph. (Reads 1st. para.) I feel sure that as far as this House is concerned it will give effect

to the prayer of this petition, and I hope that in a very short time to present to the House an act or bill embodying the request of the Women's Patriotic Association of Newfoundland, when every member will be enabled to give expression of their admiration and sincere gratitude to the women of this dominion who did so much for the comfort of the soldiers and sailors of this country during the war.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in giving my hearty support to this petition.

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

MR. LeGROW:—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting this petition.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I have much pleasure in joining with the Attorney General who has presented and the honorable and gallant gentlemen who have supported the prayer of the executive committee of the Women's Patriotic Association of Newfoundland, asking that the association be incorporated for patriotic and philanthropic purposes. The work of the association during the years of war was of incalculable value to Newfoundland's fighting forces and meant a very great deal of work for the ladies of the association and much self-sacrifice on their part. This organization represents the leaders of patriotic and philanthropic work not merely in St. John's, but throughout the entire country and did much to stimulate recruiting and provide comforts for our soldiers and sailors while overseas. I feel sure that the house will gladly accord unanimous passage to the act of incorporation which will at a later date be introduced on behalf of the executive committee of the Women's Patriotic Association by the Attorney General.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I am glad to extend to Sir Michael Cashin, the Leader of the Opposition, the courtesy of such delay as he may desire for preparation for the debate on this motion.

HON. SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the adoption of the report to the Address and Reply to His Excellency's speech be deferred till to-morrow. Sufficient time has not been given to the members on this side of the House to consider the Speech from the Throne.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—If it is the desire of the Leader of the Opposition that the report as to the Address and Reply to the Speech from the Throne be deferred till to-morrow it shall be done.

Mr. Small, on behalf of the Select Committee appointed to draft a reply to His Excellency's speech, presented the report of the Select Committee as follows:

To His Excellency Sir Charles Alexander Harris, K.C.M.G., C.B., C.V.O., Governor and Commander-in-Chief in and over the Dominion 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 Your Excellency has addressed to both houses of the Legislature.

(Signed) H. H. SMALL,
F. P. LeGROW,
W. R. WARREN.

Assembly Rooms,
April 23rd, 1920.

On motion this report was received and it was ordered that the motion for adoption stand over until to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of hon. the Minister of Justice the bill entitled "An Act respecting the effect and application of certain acts subsequent to Consolidated Statutes (third series), was introduced and read a first time, and

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

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the bill entitled "An Act to amend the Industrial Societies Act, 1919," was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the bill entitled "An Act to amend Cap. 41 of the Consolidated Statutes (third series) entitled "Of the Newfoundland Medical Board," was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the bill entitled "An Act to amend the Food Control Act, 1917," was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the bill entitled "An Act respecting the Department of Public Works" was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the bill entitled "An Act respecting the Department of Posts and Telegraphs" was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the bill entitled "An Act to Provide for the Standardization of Codfish" was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked the Hon. Minister of Justice to table all the correspondence between his department and his legal advisers in London, re the affidavit made by W. Woodford, Esquire.

Sir J. C. Crosbie asked the Acting Minister of Shipping to lay on the table of the House a copy of all cables and correspondence between his department and the United States Shipping Board with reference to the importation of a cargo of coal in the month of March.

Mr. Sullivan gave notice of question.

Mr. MacDonnell gave notice of question.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, April 23, 1920.

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

MR. MacDONNELL—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Codroy and Grand River in respect to the ferry service at the mouth of Grand River. This matter is of great importance and the people there have looked for an improvement so long and the pressing needs of a ferry boat has not been brought before the attention of the House. The freight to the settlement of Codroy and the road between Codroy and Grand River was brought across from the mouth of Grand River in a ferry and the conditions there are these: There is a large scow aboard which the teams are driven and then it is towed across to the opposite side by a punt. When there is a strong current on this part of the river the whole ferry service is tied up. Some years ago a petition was presented on this point asking that a motor boat be used instead. This matter was referred to the Department of Public Works but nothing be-

came of it. This petition which I now present is signed by about one hundred people, in fact by everybody in that section. The signatures to it include the ones of the clerymen of the district and all those of the representative people. I am sure, Sir, that being a matter of great consequence it will receive the attention which it deserves. I hope, Sir, that this petition will not be overlooked as the previous ones were and ask that it be referred to the department to which it belongs.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Pass Island, Hermitage Bay, in the District of Fortune Bay. It asks that the island be connected with the telegraph system of the country. Like the petition presented by my friend the member for St. George's, this matter has been before the House already and I trust that this petition will not be treated in the same manner as the previous ones on this point. Pass Island is of course an island and requires a cable to be connected with the telegraph system. Pass Island is quite an industrious place in Fortune Bay and I ask that the prayer of the petition be acceded to. I take this opportunity of presenting it before the Estimates come on before the House so that I may impress the House and my colleagues in the Executive Council of the necessity of the approval of this petition, and I ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Northern Arm, Exploits Bay. This place is about four miles from Botwood, the nearest telegraph office. They ask that telephone and telegraph system be extended there. There are poles extending to this place and it would only mean an expenditure of placing the wires. I hope that the prayer of this petition will be granted and ask that it be referred to the Department of Postal Telegraphs.

MR. JONES:—I beg to support the prayer of this petition as presented by my colleague, Mr. Jennings. This is a very necessary facility to the inhabitants of Northern Arm and I trust that it will receive careful attion.

MR. SAMSON:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support this petition of my colleague from the people of Northern Arm, Exploits Bay, ande hope that it will receive the attention which it deserves.

Mr. Sullivan asked the Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the table of the House copies of all correspondence respecting the engaging of the two auditors from the United States who have been in the city for the past two months, also a statement showing when they came under pay, the amount of their daily remuneration, and when it is anticipated their work will be completed.

Mr. MacDonnell asked the Hon. the Minister of Education to report what work, if any, in the nature of organization of his department has been done since his assumption of office; also what staff, if any, is therein employed; and what is the nature of the work of such staff.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in congratulation to the mover and seconder of this address and to say that they have acquitted themselves in a manner that reflects great credit on them as debators and proves that they have the qualifications which are needed to make them successful and creditable members of the Legislature. It is fortunate that the Government selected for this work men who by their

addresses put some force and earnestness into the proceedings, as in my opinion the speech itself is flat and in a great measure meaningless, requiring the vivifying enthusiasm which men of well-known gallantry and ability displayed by the gentlemen who moved and seconded this Speech from the Throne.

I join with the expression of pride contained in the Speech from the Throne at the marvellous success of the Allied armies and thankfulness at the successful termination of the great conflict, and in doing this would wish to put on record my very high appreciation of the services rendered this cause by the men from this Dominion, who in the Army and Navy displayed such exceptional valor and bravery. Newfoundland has reason to be proud of the part played by our heroes in this conflict which has placed us before the world in such a light that we could never otherwise attain and proved that for daring and exceptional bravery our soldiers and sailors take equal place with the best in the British Empire. We owe a debt of gratitude to these men which I trust will never be forgotten and it is the duty of the Government to see that proper provision is made for dependents and for those who have suffered disability which prevents them from taking up the civilian duties which they occupied previous to the conflict.

The action of the Government with regard to the regulations governing the export of fish does not meet with popular approval. I think we all admit that some kind of export regulations are absolutely necessary in the best interests of this great big fishing industry; evidently the present regulations are far from satisfactory and there is great diversity of opinion as to the results that have been attained by their enforcement. Opponents of the regulations contend that owing to the fish regulations this country has lost millions of dollars this year on the sale of codfish. In the other hand supporters of the fish regulations insist that if it had not been for the fish regulations fish would have been very much lower than it is at the present time. It would be a very great pity if the fish regulations was made a party politics discussion. Newfoundland interests can best be served by consolidating the very best talent we have in formulating legislation that will have for its object, the best interest of the country.

For many years the men engaged in the export of fish have been trying to adopt measures to control prices abroad, but unless you can have the loyal support of all the exporters, no control is possible. In the past it has been found that there was always some person ready to undersell his competitors and break the market; naturally then the only solution, as far as I can see, is some form of government control. Government control is objectional in a way and party politicsislikely to creep in. There must be some way out, and I would suggeset as a solution that in the event of an advisory board being formed it would be to the best interests of the fishing industry to cut out politics and place members or supporters of the Opposition as well as members or supporters of the Government on the advisory board.

We have now on record in connection with the present regulations protests from men who have been actively engaged in this industry and who from the knowledge of the circumstances are qualified to pronounce intelligently on the matter. Those men contend that the regulations are destructive to the best interests of the Dominion. We have seen that some of those who, in the early stages of the fish regulations were loud in sup-

port of the system to be adopted, are now vehemently denouncing the regulations and pleading for their cancellation. Only a week ago a prominent merchant naw in London cabled his firm as follows: "My opinion regulations now in force are detrimental to trade interests; if continued, curtail supplies to minimum." A message like I have referred to coming from a man like Mr. Monroe compels one to think. If the regulations as they stand are not perfect, then let us all get together and give the best that is in us and try and form some satisfactory and workable policy that will be acceptable to the great majority of the trade. I have been informed that since the regulations were put in force fish has dropped from 10 to 30 shillings a quintal, and that while the regulations kept the merchants from selling and making a fair profit our competitors came in and sold their fish.

It is agreed by many who are in accord with the regulations now in force that if there had been no regulations fish would be now down to 40 shillings a quintal. Opponents of the fish regulations on the other hand ask if the regulations kept the price of fish up, how is it that we today cannot sell our fish. From what one can learn it seems to be a case now of every one who has fish to sell getting under cover and trying to get out of the mess the best way they possibly can.

If the present regulations are detrimental to the trade of the country and especially injurious to the fishermen of the country, who will be hampered by not receiving supplies from the merchants who are curtailing their business on account of the regulations, then it is up to us all to unite and try to re-establish confidence amongst the trade and fishermen and be prepared to meet competition with other countries. Let us insist on a better cure, have a strict cull and make our fish a good marketable food commodity. Let us endeavour to get new markets and we should at once start in with propaganda work in South America; there must be great possibilities in the Argentine, Paraquay, Uruguay and other South American Republics.

I desire to express my congratulations to the Rev. Major Nangle who has been placed in charge of matters connected with the concentration and registration of the graves of our heroic dead in Europe. With Major Nangle this is a labor of love as well as duty. He as chaplain of the forces worked for their welfare, spiritual and temporal. The soldiers loved and venerated him for his faithful services as he admired and loved them for their bravery and loyalty, and it is fitting that he should now search the battlefield for the remains of those sacred dead whose memory will live as long as this Dominion lasts. The purchase of Beaumont Hamel battlefield which is associated in the minds of all of us with so many tragic memories commends itself to me as I am sure it does to all who have at heart the interests of those gallant boys of ours who fought there and who reverence the memory of those who laid down their lives there, and I greatly regret that the lady collectors who undertook to raise the funds for the purchase of that historic field did not meet with a greater measure of success. I trust, however, that they will meet with more ready response during their present efforts.

Reference is made in the Speech from the Throne to the increased surplus of the past year. This must be extremely gratifying to the Leader of the Opposition, Sir M. P. Cashin, to whose exceptional qualifications as a financier as well as to his unques-

tioned ability as an executive worker this condition of affairs is solely due, and I trust that the present holder of the office of Minister of Finance, Hon. H. J. Brownrigg, will be able to boast of the splendid surpluses which characterised the regime of the late Minister, and that he will be able to measure up to the high standard followed by his predecessor.

I am glad to note that the establishment of an improved survey of ships is contemplated, as the necessity for this cannot be exaggerated. It must be clear to all seafaring men as well as to others who are competent to judge, that up to the present time the buildings of ships in this country has not been attended with that care which is necessary for the safeguarding of life. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, the introduction of a strict and impartial survey will meet with general approval.

The creation of a Department of Posts and Telegraphs does not impress me as being by any means necessary. I think, Sir, that this is rather a retrograde step than otherwise, and I am sure that confidence in the Government will not be strengthened by the addition of another departmental head. He will not be independent in any sense because he will have to vote according to the dictation of his leader. The manner in which the Postmaster General was treated is to be deplored. In him the country had an able man, a man of impeachable character and whose work of re-construction in the departments of the Post Office and Telegraphs reflects the highest credit upon him. It is apparent that in the creation of this department the Government has been actuated by political expediency rather than by any thought of the best interests of the country. I see my hon. friend the Minister of Justice taking notes and I know by the smile on his face that he intends to tell us that the Government did not dismiss the Postmaster General, and perhaps it is true that they did not dismiss him, but nevertheless, they made things so obnoxious for him that there was nothing left for him compatible with dignity but to resign.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we come to another matter of Coastal and Inland Transportation. This is a matter in connection with which I hope the Government will take immediate steps towards improvement. The Reid Newfoundland Co. have been subjected to much abuse both in the press and on the platform in spite of the fact they have done all that could be done under the circumstances. I hold no brief for the Reid Newfoundland Co.. I owe them nothing and they owe me nothing, but we must be fair and admit that they have done exceptionally well under exceptionally adverse circumstances, and it would be indeed regrettable if they were forced to suspend the operations of the system because of the antagonistic tactics of the Government. The Government and the Reid Nfld. Co. should, in my opinion, pull together, and it will serve no purpose for the Government and the Government press to continue as they have been doing for some time past.

Now, Sir, I regret that I have searched the Speech from the Throne for reference to the many rosy promises contained in the manifesto issued by the Leader of the Government last October. I have failed to see anything with reference to the promised increase in the Poor Relief Grant which was used during the election campaign with such vigor, and indeed it is difficult to see how the poor widows and orphans find it possible to exist on the pittance they now get in face of the present high cost of

living. Old Age Pensions was another catch-cry used by our opponents, and one which proved good bait. Old age pensions were to be increased to meet all cases of the aged poor and these promises even went to the extent of including women as well as men, but still I see no mention of that now in the Speech from the Throne, nor do I see any provision whatever for our poor old worn-out fishermen. Nevertheless there seems to be no scarcity of money. Apparently there is money to burn. We are able to bring auditors from the United States to go over the public accounts because we do not consider our own auditor general competent, but Mr. Speaker, when the accounts of these men are finished we will find that the cost of bringing them here has been astounding, and it will be seen that the amount expended for this purpose will have been sufficient to meet the demands of several more old age pensioners. Is this the way in which Mr. Squires is going to carry out his promises as to the saving the peoples money. What have these men found out that would justify their having been brought here. I say, Sir, that it is not fair to the auditor general.

Then there is the matter of Education. I tell you, Mr. Speaker, there are places in this Island home of ours where there are from thirty of forty children who could go to school if they had a school to go to, but we find nothing to indicate that there is any intention of doing anything to improve the matter in this regard. This is not what people had expected. The same may be said of the high cost of living. I have yet to see what the government has done to lower prices or in any way make things easy for the people to whom they promised so much. We have flour up to eighteen dollars a barrel, molasses two dollors a gallon, and coal nineteen dollars, when we can get it, and it is rationed out to you in very small lots at that.

Prohibition, I would like to ask if it is the intention of the Prime Minister to bring in a bill to amend the present prohibition law as promised by him in his manifesto; the law as it now stands is not impartial, the man with the money and the pull can get all the liquor he requires, but the poor man must be content with Essence of Vanilla, Wood Alcohol, concoctions of Tanlac, Copper Paint and two in one Shoe Polish; would it not be much better to give the people an opportunity of drinking decent beer, good whiskey, rum, or gin, than drinking the dope as they are now doing. I hope to deal more extensively with this matter at a later date on the floor of this house.

I notice that an attempt is being made to settle the Labrador boundary. I hope our interests will be well looked after and that everything will be done to see that there is no territory taken from Newfoundland and handed over to Canada.

I am glad to note that it is the intention of the Government to wind up the Department of Militia and the Department of Shipping at an early date, it should be quite feasable now to let the Pay Office and Pensions Board handle everything in connection with the Militia Department, the sooner the the Department of Militia is wound up the more money will be saved by the taxpayers. The reorganization of the Department of Marine and Fisheries will have the support of all who have the best interests of the country at heart. The creation of an Information Bureau and Scientific Research Department should, if properly organized, be of financial benefit to the country.

With reference to the problems of Coastal Service, this is a matter of

great importance to the whole country. Traffic has increased so tremendously the last ten years that the facilities offered the public are not half able to meet the requirements. I trust the Government will see its way clear to put on a boat from Trepassey to Placentia, and an extra steamer on Placentia Bay. The Argyle is not large enough to meet the requirements of Placentia Bay and Burin District. A large number of the people of Placentia Bay reside on the islands and it is most important that much better coastal service than they have at the present time should be provided. I trust that when arrangements are being made for additional coastal service boats, that Placentia, St. Mary's and Trepassey Bays will not be overlooked.

Another matter which needs immediate attention and which is mentioned in the Speech is the re-organization of the Department of Agriculture and Mines. We are not getting half the revenue that we should from this department, owing to the fact that hundreds of square miles of our timber resources are held up by speculators and not being developed in accordance with the conditions in the Crown Lands Act. I trust that at an early date that the Prime Minister who is representing the Minister of Agriculture and Mines in this House, will introduce a bill that will have for its object the cancellation of all timber grants now held by speculators, and when cancelled should be handed back to the Crown and sold by public auction, and a further revenue could be derived when the lands are developed by charging a stumpage of so much per thousand feet, F. B.M. There is another very important matter which comes under the Department of Agriculture and Mines, that is the question of reafforestation. I have discussed this matter with the Hon. Dr. Campbell and explained the great financial benefits that could be obtained by scientific re-afforestation. England and Scotland have been working on scientific lines for a number of years, and since the war all the Dominions, with the exception of Newfoundland, are having men trained so that they can go in for re-afforestation on scientific lines. The Hon. Dr. Campbell seems to be in accord with the idea of conservation of our forest areas, and I trust that his sound judgment will prevail on the Government and induce them to make a handsome vote for the establishment of garden nurseries, with a view to re-afforestation in the years to come. A grant of $100,000 now and an annual grant of $20,000 a year for the next twenty or thirty years would give a national asset that in fifty years would be worth at least $30,-000,000.

I was no believer in re-afforestation until I went overseas and saw what had been done in Scotland. One small plot of land only three-quarters of a square mile in area was purchased by the British Government for £45,000. This timber was planted one hundred years ago, but had reached maturity at eighty years. In addition to the amount of £45,000 paid by the government for the standing timber at that time, the former owners had already sold several thousand pounds worth of timber from the same plot. The results obtained in Scotland could, I feel confident, be duplicated here, and in my opinion, any money spent on re-afforestation would yield handsome returns.

MR. MOORE:—Mr. Speaker, I wish to engage the attention of the House while I refer to some of the important matters that do not appear in the Speech from the Throne, but before doing so let me tender to you my heartiest congratulations upon your

election as Speaker of this House. I assure you that you will receive no trouble from the junior member for Ferryland. I must also extend my sincere congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to His Excellency's Speech. These gentlemen, I feel sure, ought to be proud of the position they occupy in this Assembly on its opening, and those who were associated with them overseas must also feel delighted with the able and creditable manner in which they have acquitted themselves today.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne, to my mind, and I have had an experience of twelve years in this House, is the most inflated balloon that ever went up in this House. It was manufactured in the Executive Council and brought up and handed to the Governor to be read on opening day. In his speech there is a paragraph that has appeared in every speech during my time in the Assembly. That paragraph has reference to the boundary line at Labrador. In other respects, it differs from any Speech read in this House, as it is "much ado about nothing."

In the first paragraph of the Speech His Excellency says that he is very thankful that the great war is over and the Government is about to do something for those who took part in it; but, Mr. Speaker, when we look around the House, we can see for ourselves the positions that have been filled in the past few weeks, and will show you what they intend to do for the soldiers and sailors who participated in the great war.

The sergeant-at-arms, who is a personal friend of mine, and who is a pensioner, has taken the place of a man who sent three sons overseas. Why not increase his pension and give this position to a returned soldier, many of whom, though maimed, could fill this position, and who, on coming into this House, would remind us of the great sacrifices that were made. Take the position of Mr. Winter, the solicitor of this House. There was an application made to the Government from a man who served three years in the war, but it was turned down. This man was rejected because Mr. Winter had a pull with the Minister of Justice and therefore got the position. Mr. Carter, another particular friend of mine, was one whom we all realize went overseas with the Blue Puttees and for this reason got the position which he deserves. The supervisor of debates in this House and the supervisor in the Upper House, were appointed because of their great war services, and yet we are told that the Government is working in the interest of returned soldiers and sailors. You might say, why did not your government do it when they were in? I will say, in all sincerity, that any position that came before the Government for a position to be filled by a returned soldier, was acceded to as far as possible. Take the position today in the Custom House, a position made vacant by an old friend of mine, the late H. Broderick. That position was also filled by a returned soldier who was defeated in St. John's West. There is another gentleman who met his Waterloo in that District, who, as a prominent supporter of the Government, received every consideration and recognition of his services. The Government used every means, legitimate and illegitimate, to provide him with a seat, but failed, and, as a last resort, placed him in the Legislative Council, where today he holds the position of Minister of Agriculture and Mines. We were expecting that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who, in his public career, has claimed to be consistent, would have raised

an objection to the holding of this position by a member of the Upper House. I would ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to look back over the last eight years; I would ask him to look to the time when he defeated Mr. Blandford in the good old District of Bonavista. My friends, Mr. Winsor and Mr. Abbott, will remember that he held forth from this side of the House with all the intensity that he could muster, and we are all aware of his ability as speaker. He condemned the illegality of Mr. Blandford holding the position of Minister of Agriculture and Mines while occupying a seat in the Upper House, after he had been defeated by the electors of Bonavista Bay.

If the position that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries then took is sound, I think you will admit that the arguments he then used against Mr. Blandford would in like measure apply to the case of Dr. Campbell. I think the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries will be fair enough to admit that this argument is sound. Dr. Campbell has never been elected in St. John's West, and probably never will be elected for a constituency in this country.

We are told in the Speech from the Throne that we are to have three or four warships come over here, and that through the instrumentality of certain members of the Government, those warships were being made a present to us by the Imperial Government. Both Leaders of the Government have claimed credit for his success in providing those ships. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries proclaimed in The Advocate after his arrival that he had secured this great boon from the Imperial Government, and after it, we are informed that the matter was brought about through the instrumentality of the Prime Minister. It looks as if these gentlemen might yet quarrel over this very trifling matter as to whom the real credit belongs. In my opinion, the late government should claim the credit for the securing of those ships, as the matter was brought to the attention of the Imperial Government long before their resignation. If the members of the present Executive Council had been down on the Labrador and never saw the House of Assembly, those ships would come over. In my opinion, those who really deserve the credit for the consideration given us by the Imperial Government in providing those ships for public service in this Colony, are those boys in blue who fought for me, for Mr. Archibald and other gentlemen like him who donned the khaki of the cloth of those who moved for a select committee. These are the men who deserve really the credit of bringing those warships to Newfoundland, and not those who constitute the Executive Government.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission I beg to refer for a few minutes to an incident that happened in this House on opening day. I have always been an admirer of the Prime Minister in this House, as I sat with him on the Government side for four years when he was member for Trinity. I have always admired his debating power, his fluency and great ability, but I am sorry that he saw fit on the occasion I refer to, to use language which may be characterized as rough-house stuff, in this chamber, which neither does credit to himself or the standing of Parliament. I will not refer to his utterance, but will leave it to more able hands than mine, beyond telling him that he has lost cast and has lost friends by the way he replied to the Leader of the Opposition. The conduct of the Prime Minister with re-

gard to the charge made against him by a prominent public man, does not meet with the confidence or approval of this House. It may meet with the approval of those on the Government side, who are anxious to retain him in the position which he now occupies, but the dignity and independence of the Legislature has been seriously sullied and interferred with by the Prime Minister, who refuses to explain away the charge that has been made against him, or absent himself from the House until such time as he has been vindicated by a public tribunal. A public meeting of citizens of St. John's was convened in this city to represent to His Excellency the Governor the serious irregularity of permitting a Prime Minister to be present in the House whilst this cloud was hanging over him. This petition did not receive that consideration from His Excellency which its importance demanded. They had a right to be heard and their petition should, in a measure, have been acceded to. But I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that their petition to this House will be respected when presented, and will receive the hearty support of the twelve apostles who sit on this side.

MR. VINICOMBE:—Mr. Speaker, I rise to say a few words in connection tion with the Speech from the Throne, but before proceeding, Sir, allow me to congratulate you on the high position you have been appointed to and I hope and trust that when your duties will have been performed that you will have done justice to us and we to you in this House.

This Speech from the Throne is remarkable for what it does not contain. As you know, Sir, the Prime Minister on last November promised faithfully, among other things, that he would reduce the high cost of living and I have a faint rememberance that the three Squires representatives used this same vote-catching process in St. John's East last fall. They appealed to the people and told them that they would reduce the high cost of living and said that the high prices of coal, flour, molasses, boots, etc., were attributed to the late administration, but, Sir, I am proud to be able to say that the St. John's East people were not caught in the trap and did not believe the flapdoodle handed out to them.

I find that since the present Government assumed power, some five months ago, and as a previous speaked has said, that flour is now $16.50. One of the largest flour importers in the country informed me within the past twenty-four hours that the next shipment of flour that reaches here will cost $17 wholesale, which will mean that the consumer will have to pay $18. I understand also that next week molasses will be $1.80 a gallon, sugar 28 cents a pound, while the price of boots has increased beyond all proportions. Now this latter commodity was the chief stock in trade of the Squires representatives in St. John's East. They used hold up the boots to the people and tell them that such and such a price was that the Cashin party were charging for boots. Today if you go on Water Street to buy a pair of boots you will have to get on your high heel boots to reach the price.

The Leader of the Government wiil tell us that he intended to organize a consumer's league or food control board. Unfortunately there is a food control board, but what have they done? Nothing. Have that board done anything to put down the high cost of living? Prices are continuing to soar daily, with coal at $19 a ton. We have been told by the Premier that he was going to do a lot of wonderful things for the people. Well, then,

if he can do these things he should act and act quickly, because I can assure him that the people are not going to allow themselves to be so heavily burdened with the high cost of living much longer and an uprising will likely be the result. When people were earning three or four shillings a day years ago, they were better off than they are today.

The Prime Minister, in his manifesto, blamed Sir P. T. McGrath, chairman of the food control board, for the high cost of living, and stated that Sir M. P. Cashin was the friend of the profiteers. If that was the case then it is only logical that the present Premier is the friend of the profiteers now. Things generally and particularly the ordinary necessities of life have soared higher within the past few months than ever before.

There is a paragraph in His Excellency's Speech which reads as follows:

"My Ministers appreciate the dona-
"tion by the British Admiralty to
"Newfoundland of two ships hitherto
"used for naval purposes. These two
"ships, together with a third ship
"purchased from the British Admir-
"alty by the Government are now
"being prepared at Chatham for their
"voyage to Newfoundland. It is pos-
"sible that one of these ships will be
"used as a coastal boat: another as
"a supply ship in conection with the
"lighthouse department, and the third
"for emergency and rescue purposes."

It is all very fine, as a previous speaker has said, to feel elated over the idea that any man representing the Government in this Colony were responsible for the securing of those ships. However, there seems to be a diversity of opinion as to which man got them. When the Hon. Mr. Coaker arrived here from his trip abroad, and I hope that his trip will bear fruit for this Colony, The Evening Advocate sounded the praises of Mr. Coaker and said that he had secured two ships and bought one. The next night The Daily Star retaliated and said that the Prime Minister had got them. I contend that these two men are likely to fall out over the matter and that the Prime Minister will appeal to the Minister of Justice and he will be "warrin."

Another paragraph in the Speech from the Throne reads:

"An effort is being made by the
"Government to wind up the Depart-
"ment of Militia and the Department
"of Shipping at the earliest possible
"moment. The Newfoundland. Pay
"and Record Office in London has al-
"ready been closed. The work of the
"Civil Re-Establishment Committee
"will, it is hoped, during the year, be
"brought practically to an end, and
"the matter of medical treatment of
"returned soldiers and sailors will be
"concentrated in one hospital build-
"ing so as to give greater efficiency of
"service at a very greater reduced ex-
"penditure of public funds. If the
"burden of expenditure resulting from
"the war may seem a heavy one let
"us remember that it represents the
"least that we can do for those who
"enabled Newfoundland to take her
"stand in the forefront of humanity's
"great battle."

I think, Mr. Speaker, that that paragraph is downright hypocrisy, especially when we remember that a Government paper, controlled by the Prime Minister, put into print the records of some of those young men who went out on the battlefields and did their bit for their country. Furthermore I think it is a disgrace and a crying shame that the records and characters of these young heroes were besmeared and blackened as they were by the newspaper referred to, and scattered broadcast throughout the length and breadth of the

country. I did not see anything about this in the Speech from the Throne.

Sir Michael Cashin had a son who played a prominent part in the great war, Mr. Bennett had three sons, Mr. MacDonnell had a brother who went overseas at the beginning with Lieut. Small and was killed, Mr. Moore had three nephews who took part in it, Mr. Higgins lost his only brother, Mr. Sinnott had a son, Sir J. C. Crosbie a nephew, and Major Sullivan. We all remember the good work at recruiting Mr. Fox did, and as for myself I had three nephews and a cousin who engaged against the Hun, and the cousin died of wounds. I am not surprised, therefore, that the last speaker was so pronounced in condemning the present Government for ignoring the returned soldiers.

The next paragraph of His Excellency's Speech deals with Beaumont Hamel battlefield. For this I must congratulate the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as I understand that it was through his activities and his energy that this was secured. I am sorry to hear that the ladies who were collecting for this purpose did not meet with as much success as they anticipated. However, they ought not to have much trouble in making up the $10,000 if the Government would help them.

The Prime Minister referred in his manifesto to prohibition and promised to have adjusted this much vexed question. I want to say right here that something should be done to alter the state of affairs that exist in Newfoundland today. When the hon. member for Placentia spoke on this topic this afternoon he did not paint it any worse than what it really is. There are a number of old men all over the country who have been in the habit of drinking rum moderately all their lifetime are now deprived of this little luxury, and there are many old worn out fishermen who need liquor as a stimulant. If they go to a doctor and not bosom friends of his it is no use in their asking for a script because they will be refused, though the same doctor will give it to other and younger men who are in their perfect health.

Now when the Prime Minister brings it before the House I don't know whether I will support it, as I do not know in what form it will be. I shall wait and see.

Then there is another paragraph taken from the Speech, but while it is last it is not least, and I think should have received an important place in the Speech from the Throne. As Mr. Anderson, who is the organizer of this company for the erection of workingmen's homes, was going around the town yesterday delighted that it was placed in the Speech, I think it was only through Mr. Anderson's political influence that it got a place there at all. Well, Sir, I agree with the movement, and I think that the Government and the Opposition will do all in their power to help the movement along. Mr. Anderson, I am sorry to have, has realized that the houses could not be built for one thousand dollars. The day is gone when houses could be erected for eight hundred, one thousand twelve hundred dollars. The cost today well exceeds two thousand dollars. My friend, Mr. Anderson, has a hobby for facts and figures, as my friend Mr. Brownrigg well knows, nevertheless the movement will receive my hearty support. The housing problem today is a disgrace to this Dominion, to the people and to the good name they bear. You will find sympathy, but none when it touches their pockets. Today the rents asked are exorbitant, and something should be done. I understand

that a law was passed last year whereby no person could raise the rent, which they are doing today, but the tenants cannot complain as they will be put on the street. Mr. Anderson is going to build twenty or thirty houses, but before the next session is over I hope there will be one hundred houses built.

Now, Sir, on Wednesday some of my colleagues who addressed the chair said it was the first time that they spoke from this side of the House. I can assure you, Sir, it is also my first time, but I hope and trust the day will come when I shall make an address from the other side of the House. I assure you, Sir, that while you occupy the position you now hold you will find that I will cause you no trouble, and that you will not have to order me out of the House.

I read in last night's Star that Councillor Nix did not speak on Wednesday, but that I was wise. That is no news for the public, for the public well known that all wise people come from the East, and it was wise men that elected us here, and I hope and trust will do credit to our constituency, and when we go back to our District we will be able to say we fought your battles well. I will leave other remarks for a future time.

DR. JONES:—Mr. Speaker, in rising to address the House for the first time, I ask your permission to preface my remarks with a few words of congratulation and of explanation.

When I entered this House a few days ago, it was with some reluctance as to the propriety of my doing so, but the proceedings on that day have convinced me I am in pretty good surroundings. I stand here tonight like the Prime Minister, under a charge of bribery, but in my case no person has been able to swear that I have attempted to bribe him, but the same cannot be said for him. The fact that this House has endorsed his action in coming here ,has given me the right to stand here tonight apart from my personalinclinations in the matter.

I offer you sincere congratulations on your elevation to the position of first commoner. While I do not pose as a authority in such matter I am sure the older members of this Assembly will agree that your calmness and dignity on taking up your position indicate that you will maintain the highest traditions of the office, with myself and the other juniors who will unwillingly trangress the rules I am sure you will deal gently with the erring. I also take this opportunity to tender my congratulations to the historic town of Carbonear which has given to many of her sons to high positions in both church and state in the honour done her by your appointment, while I have not had the good fortune to have been born in that town, associations of kindred and otherwise make it pleasing to me to pay this small tribute.

Recent events have thrown a nasty black cloud over Harbor Main, and the citizens of that District have been pilloried and held up to the country as the greatest set of grafters that ever exisfed. They have been abused and vilified in the newspapers as well as in the platform. While I am here as its sole representative I shall do my best to prove that these charges were unfounded and I hope that the Prime Minister will come out of the Royal Commission with as clean a record as the District of Hr. Main.

The subject of the Speech from the Throne is one that in the main affects us outport members probably more than it does the city. All the

members of outport districts will agree with me when I say that a great deal more attention is paid to the Speech when it appears in the newspapers and read in the outports than you can imagine. Reading matter is scarce in the outports and every letter and advertisement that appears in the city press is eagerly read by our outport people. It is customary to outline in the Speech from the Throne any new legislation that is to be introduced by the Government and as a rule when a Government has been in power for some years the Speech from the Throne is somewhat uninteresting, but when a new Government comes into power we expect something interesting and something new, and watch the papers for its first announcement. Disappointment is unnecessary because after scanning the Speech from top to bottom I fail to see anything in it that would appeal to our people at home.

Regarding that paragraph of His Excellency'c speech dealing with the gift of the two ships by the British Excellency's Speech dealing with the preciate the generous donation, as a small recognition of Newfoundland's participation in the great war.

As to the Labrador boundry, I may say that that question has been in abeyance for many years. No doubt it is being given great consideration and I hope that it will be set tled to the satisfaction of the country.

I am glad to know that the department of militia is to be wound up. As far as the outports are concerned they were under the impression that the war was over two years ago, tho' in the city to day one can see many soldiers still going about in khaki.

It is very satisfactory to know that the revenue last year exceeded the estimates, due no doubt to the high costs of goods on which we levied an advalorem duty. But, after all the time has come when we must make our clothes according to the cloth and make our expenditure fit the revenue; and we must prepare for the falling off in revenue which must come later when a fall takes place in the cost of goods imported and make conditions correspond with these changes.

Regarding the department of agriculture, I may say that this is a department in which I take particular interest. Hr. Main is more or less an agricultural district and its people are interested in everything that tends to improve the state of agriculture. The new minister, Hon. Dr. Campbell is a man full of energy, there is no disproving that fact, I hope that he will display that energy in reorganizing that department and that he will introduce some new ideas so that good results will accrue. At the same time the question of reorganization is a matter that ought to receive great consideration and no doubt, it will when the mattercomes up at a later date in detail. We have been dickering with this agricultural problem for years and years but with very little results . To-day it is impossible to get a barrel of good potatoes or a ton of hay anything after the rate in the country. That is really a reproach to the country. If there is any produce that can be raised in Newfoundland, certainly it should be hay and potatoes.

As far as the department of marine and fisheries is concerned it is not for me to say very much further than to make a commentary on the fish regulations that were enforced last year. They have practically paralized fishing activities in my district and alarming reports of the curtailment of supplies and the falling off of prices of fish have scared the wits out of those who supply and who prosecute the fishery. The result is, that hundreds of our fishermen have

gone away out of the country perhaps never to return. Thirty years ago there were from fifteen to twenty schooners prosecuting the Labrador fishery and many western schooners from every harbor in the head of the bay. To-day there are not five schooners in the head of the bay, and none of them for the western fishery. Within the last few years owing to the high cost of outfitting the fleet has dwindled down and it has been Labrador fishermen mainly that have been keeping up the reputation of the place as a fishing district, but this year I regret to say, there is no interest taken at all, as prospects are so gloomy and the cost of salt, lines and provisions necessary for the prosecution of the voyage are so high. Whether or not conditions will improve by the proposed reorganization of the Marine and Fisheries Department remains to be seen.

I particularly noticed that the Address from the Throne did not contain anything about the pre-election promises of the Prime Minister. I do not suppose there is any man who comes into any more daily contact with the poor all over the country with the exception of the clergymen than does the doctor. No one knows better than he their wants or how difficult it is for them to live. The pauper relief that they get, which is at the rate that they were paid thirty years ago, it is utterly impossible for them to live on. The small increase that they were given during all that period has been practically negligible. There was an increase in old age pensions promised by the Prime Minister, and I had hoped to see some reference to it in the Governor's speech, but unfortunately it was not mentioned. There are also many old men who were qualified to receive the pension, and who have now their application in for some time but have not received it as the grant is so small. Quite recently I was forcibly struck in a couple of instances where I came across a few old age pensioners who had been in receipt of this pension for a year or two then died, and their wives were left with no provision at all for them. And it was only after the greatest difficulty that these old aged widows got any assistance, miserable pittance that it is, from the Poor Department. Everybody realises what a great hardship it must be on these poor people to live. After the wife of a pensioner has enjoyed the pension for a short time her husband dies and the pension ceases, and she is left on the verge of starvation. It is only those who come into daily contact with these cases who can properly appreciate what they are like.

With regard to prohibition. . This subject affects the whole Island and is one which I have a personal knowledge of. There are many ways of looking at the prohibition question and some of them are in a manner prejudicial. There are men anxious to get liquor selling back again, and there are those who do not want it. In my district I find that the present prohibition act is a farce and nothing better. By depriving our people of the use of liquor it has driven them to drink concoctions of all sorts that are not fit for human consumption, and which are destroying the constitution of men.

Some years ago we had the license system in our district and there was undoubtedly excessive drinking. Then through the exertions of the clergymen a local option act was put in force by the voice of the people. Conditions greatly improved as the boys grew up with little or no acquaintance with liquor.

Unless somebody brought liquor from St. John's the boys never saw it. Then when the prohibition came in force the older people who could not adopt themselves to the circumstances took to the making of moon-

shine. In the district of Harbor Main there is no monopoly of this manufacture but it is made all over Newfoundland. It is not hard to get or even to make it. The boys are again learning to drink and are being destroyed by this preparation. This much I will say that I do not believe in going back to the open saloons. But I believ e that the prohibition law should be so regulated that there would be no hardship in procuring liquor and that it could be got in an limited quantity for drinking purposes and I think it would better matters all round. As a medical practitioner I know of the hardships created under the present law when a person only wishes to get a small quantity for medical purposes. The ordinary poor person who is sick does not want to buy an eight or ten oz. bottle. In my district to send for a small quantity to St. John's and get it takes a long time and with a probability of being lost in transit. Tho I never drink myself I am not a crank on temperance and take this occasion to state that I would not be the man to withhold spirits from any person who needed them for a medicine. There is no provision in the prohibition act as to supply spirits at local centres. While our district is in actual contract with St. John's when liquor is required for medicine valuable time is often lost in the case of an emergency in obtaining it, but what must it be in the remote parts of the country. There should be some provision made so that large or small quantities could be procured as desired.

On the train a few days ago I met a man who belonged to the bottom of Bonavista Bay and he said it is almost impossible to get liquor as even when a prescription is secured to get it, it may not reach him over the railroad as liquor shipments disappear en route or the person who needed it may be dead before it arrived. I would like to see something done to alleviate the present situation and have the prohibition question discussed here. There are many important issues involved and it would require careful consideration and pains to provide a system whereby the necessary medicine could be provided conveniently. I call it medicine for I use it always as medicine.

We of the District of Harbor Main are of course interested in the country's transportation facilities and the problems confronting the country generally. The people of Harbor Main built the railroad in the old days and they regret to see its condition today. But it is a problem which requires the consideration of the House fully and when the matter comes up everybody should give it serious thought, as to how its condition is to be bettered. As we all know the war threw new burdens on the railway and some people thought now that the war is over, these tremendous burdens would be removed and the road be expected to carry out its pre-war traffic; but the road is worn out and the burden is increased instead of diminished. The pulp mills and other industries as well as the branch lines have given it a traffic for which it was never intended. The supply of shipping along the coast would lessen the load of the railroad, but we are short of ships and are no nearer getting them than two years ago. We depend on the railroad to do that for which it was never intended. Today we find the branch roads in actual distress because of the excessive demands (partly on account of the fortunes of war) thrown upon them and if we go back to ten years ago we find they were in far superior condition.

The matter of communication is of serious moment and we should take it

up and give it very great consideration, and when the subject comes up before the House I trust it will be dealt with adequately.

The question of creating a new department of education is one bristling with difficulties. Such a department ought to receive from every member a careful consideration and he ought to do what he thinks is best with due regard to the interests of everybody and avoid anything that may be disadvantageous or of a dangerous character, and when it really comes round I hope every member will give it the intensity and earnestness which the subject deserves.

I am particularly anxious to see something done to improve the postal telegraph system. Tde department of telegraphs at the same time ought to be modernized and I may say that since my hon. friend Mr. Halfyard has taken charge I have not seen any remarkable improvement. I take an interest in most matters, but especially communication by way of mail or telegraph, and I may say that I receive as large a mail as any outport doctor. From experience during the past winter I find that both the telegraph and the mail service are bad. Letters go astray and cannot be located. During the first part of March I had several letters go astray between Avondale and St. John's and though I wrote the acting Minister of Posts and Telegraphs I have to date not had the courtesy of a reply. The telegraph service is also poor and there have been unnecessary delays in forwarding messages. I do not s ay that there is any slackness in the ma nagement but that there is not that efficient service that one should expect, in the handling of business.

As to other matters referred to in the Speech I shall defer comment until legislation concerning them shall come before the House.

Through some arrangements, the particulars of which I do not now intend to go into, the District of Harbor Main has been short of one half of its representation, and the whole burden of representing that district on the floors of this House falls on my shoulders and until some higher authority decides otherwise I intend to do so to the best of my ability.

MR. MacDONNELL:—Mr. Speaker, in the consideration of this Address and Reply to the Speech from the Throne I will occupy the attention of the House for a little wdile. I notice that in paragraph one it is the intention of the Government to introduce a bill for the creation of a Department of Education. I tried yesterday by directing a question to the Minister of Education to secure some information as to the work done by this department up to date. I regret that he did not see fit today to give me the information but informed me that he would do so when the Bill was introduced. In doing this the Hon. Dr. Barnes is still living up to the traditions of this department. For what reason I know not, but there has been a wonderful air of secrecy with reference to everything appertaining to the Department of Education; and the Minister even informed me today in a somewhat mysterious manner that I could not get the information. And further I am glad to see that he is living up to the traditions connected with the department up to the present in that he keeps us in the dark. To my mind, Sir, no bill should be introduced during this session about which there is no information and what bill is more important and deserving of consideration than a bill to create a Department of Education. For that reason, Sir, I think the conduct of the Government in its

withholding to this date all information as to its intention in this matter, all information as to the scope of he bill, all information as to the duties of the Minister of Education is nothing short of criminal. A bill to create a Deartment of Education may effect the education of the whole country. The educational principles therein involved require a thorough investigation and consideration. I presume the House will be asked to rush through this bill without giving it the consideration which it ought to receive and such consideration I hope it will receive from every member of the House. I have had some connection, Sir, with this matter both as a teacher for seven years in this country and for four years with the Department of Education, Roman Catholic Schools. And I know there will be grave problems to be adjusted. And I feel that the Government long ago should have given us that data which may be necessary for us to consider if this bill is to be considered in an intelligent and reasonable manner. I presume, Sir, that the work of this department will be more than than which is now done by the clerk at the Colonial Secretary's Department. I presume something in the nature of the reorganization of the education of the country will be effected. And, Sir, with all respect to the members on the other side of the House, and particularly those of the Cabinet, that while giving them all the credit which is their due and that we give them credit for their ability which is theirs, I say that there are those of us who are much interested in all that appertains to education and I think that the House should take notice for future reference that up to the present we have all been kept in the dark despite the protests of the press and the platform and the requests of those in authority, for information on this point. And that when the time comes and when this bill is attempted to be rushed thru the House the blame for an imperfect bill and its workings will be placed upon the right shoulders. The responsibility of this measure will be placed upon the members of the Government in particular. Those on this side of the House will, as I think I speak their mind along with myself, give every assistance in such a matter of grave importance, but I wish to intimate that we will not be rushed and we will not allow as far as we can a bill of this nature to be rushed through the House without having thoroly and carefully considered and thrashed out every particular of it. I shall have more to say on this matter as regards this point in the Speech from the Throne when I get my information from the Minister of Education on the day when the Bill is introduced.

And I also notice that another Department which will be remodeled is the Deartment of Agriculture and Mines. I take it that the first step in remodelling this department is that the head of this department should not be a member of this House. I do not know what sin the members of this House are responsible for that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines cannot sit among us. It is rather a round about way to get information when one has to depend upon some other member to transmit it to him.

The Minister may, because of his absence, be able to pursue his way far from the madding crowd's ignoble strife. We will all await with anxiety for the good tidings from the absent departmental head.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak of another matter, it is the Department of Posts and Telegraphs. Whether the creation of such a department is wise or unwise, I would not like to say

just now, but this much is true that since the Hon. W. W. Halfyard has taken charge of this department, there have been many things which the public generally have not approved of. Nobody expects him to work wonders in a short time, but I will call attention to the fact that the delivery of mails in this country has never been worse. There are obstacles, nobody will deny that. I would point out that until such time as proper inspectors are appointed for the far removed sections of the country we will have trouble. All is not well merely because a head is appointed.

We must consider other parts than St. John's. The various needs must be met in their own peculiar way. It is not enough to pattern the service of the country after the system in St. John's. There is something wrong with the system here in St. John's. Charges have been made that eveu registered letters have not been delivered.

The Minister of Posts and Telegraphs has many serious duties and all possible assistance should be given him.

There is another matter Mr. Speaker to which I would like to refer, namely transportation. It should have been given more consideration in the Speech from the Throne. Branch railroads are not mentioned at all. Those of us who live in the remote sections of the country would like to see it given its just consideration. Communication is like the blood in the arteries of the body. I am going to speak from the standpoint of the district which I represent. Governments of the past have had an excellent policy for the construction of branch railroads. The people all over the country have been taxed to build them. They have had to stand their share of taxation.

St. George's has had to bear its part of the burden, although we have been utterly ignored. Perhaps it is because there is a story about St. George's that has not been told. Take the Peninsula of Port au Port, and the only communication the people have with the railway is over a delapidated road built badly about twenty years ago. While other districts have had branch railways, we could not even get a decent highway. A branch line is absolutely necessary, starting at Stephenville Crossing and right round thru Stephenville and right round the Port au Port Peninsula. The population in this area is about 3,000 and these people have absolutely no communication by rail. The people have been compelled to bring the necessities of life over a road eighteen miles, badly built in the beginning, and which has never received adequate repairs. Special grants are an unknown quantity in the district of St. George's.

The coastal service has become worse instead of better. There is now no port of call in Bay St. George. There were two ports of call, but the wise men, usually taken from this city, decided that it wasn't necessary to have Sandy Point and Port au Port ports of call. We were told we had a daily train service. There is a story in connection with this, and I am going to tell it. I can remember in this connection a good story of one time when the returning officer for the district during a certain campaign submitted his expense account in connection with the carrying of the ballot boxes in from the various settlements. An official of the Government took exception to the amount expended for this purpose and wanted to know why, when he had a daily train, the men could not call at the stations and put the boxes on board the train. Imagine men walking thirty miles to the train but this man did not know but the train stopped at every hamlet in the district. When we have men like this in responsible positions, and I might say that this man still holds

a Government appointment, what can we expect!

I confidently look to the Government to take some steps to make up in the future for the negligence that the district of Bay St. George has suffered from in the past because of absolute ignorance of this kind. Now, Sir, as I believe that any mention of branch lines would have not been omitted from the Speech from the Throne if the Government really intended doing anything. I would ask that if a railway line cannot be considered, these important settlements of Port au Port and Sandy Point be at least made ports of call for the coastal steamers so that they can be connected up with the regular bay service. The manner in which the contract for the bay service was made bears out my statement as to the ignorance of those responsible for that contract of the conditions as they exist in the district of St. George. We have a steamer on that run and a time table was drawn up for her to run by. She was to arrive at a fixed time and leave at a fixed time. The schedule was for the boat to leave St. George on Monday and get back there on Friday, and if this was not done the reason for such failure could not be understood.

What was the result? On the whole of the peninsula of Port au Port there is not a harbor where a vessel can put up during stormy weather from the time she leaves St. George's till she gets back there again. Perhaps by the time the steamer was ready to get away a north west gale would have sprung up making it impossible for her to call at many of the nearest ports, and the same thing applied on the outside shore in a southerly breeze. If the people who drew up the contract knew anything about the conditions to be contended with, they would have left it to the captain to regulate his own schedule. If he found he could not do this work on the south side of the peninsula he could go to the north side and attend to the ports of call there. This contract, I understand is still running. I do not know if the government has the power to re-model it, but if they have I would respectfully submit that they get together and reconstruct the whole thing, and I should be glad to do anything in my power to assist them. The matters I have referred to are of very grave consequence, although my remarks may not have been interesting to many of the honorable members of the House. I will show in a very few moments why this matter is of importance when I tell this House that the result of the neglect of government after government for the interests of the district of St. George's has been to drive the trade of the section toHalifax, Sydney and other Canadian centres, and not alone the trade but the sympathies of the people tending towards Canada.

If the present Government desires to have this continue, they have only to follow in the steps of previous administrations. This, Mr. Speaker, is not the story of my district alone. There are at least two other members of this Assembly whose districts have suffered in the same way and particularly is this so of the member for St. Barbe, the western section of which is similarly situated. This condition of affairs, to my mind, demands that something be done immediately to remedy it, and I am prepared in all these matters to give every support and my best advice to the Government in removing the existing evils.

When you consider, Sir, that in the various sections of that district there are settlements only three miles distant from each other and still absolutely unconnected by even an attempt at a road, you must admit that conditions are pretty serious. There are dozens of places in the Bay of Islands section, around the arms, that

are only four or five miles apart without either roads or schools. It is impossible to place schools there under present conditions but if there were roads the problem could be solved by putting one school where it would serve two or three places.

I think, Sir, and I am sure that every member of this House will agree with me, that every man, no matter what his standing, has the same right to participate in the benefits and advantages of civilization as any other man, and I feel sure that when all these matters are placed before the House in the form of petitions, some of which I now have here, I am confident that the House will look them squarely in the face and give the people of St. George's their fair share of the revenue which they so largely contribute to, for expenditure in the public improvements.

There is another grant of which my district should get a larger portion than it has in the past. I refer now to the marine grant. The western side of the island has never received the share of this that it is entitled to. There is the thriving settlement of Codroy where on many occasions last year the Captain of the Portia absolutely refused to call because there was no light on Codroy Island. He held that it was not safe to call there except in fair weather. Now, Sir, if this was a small village I could understand this neglect, altho I should not attempt to justify it, but Codroy is a busy town and in being cut off entirely from any connedtion with any adequate service, is up against difficulties which in its case should not exist.

The only communication Codroy has with the railway is by means of ten or twelve miles from Little River station and this road is cut in two by the mouth of Grand River. In connection with the ferry service across this river I presented a petition today which I trust will receive the attentiton its urgency demands.

Now, Sir, I am sure honorable members will see that when all supplies needed by the people of this busy town who are perhaps the largest exporters of frsh ,fish on the west coast, for the carrying on of their business are ferried across from one side to another and then brought five or six miles on horses and carts; when all these supplies are carried five miles by cart, then by water, and another five by cart to a settlement, a remedy must be found and found at once. In this connection, Sir, if the conditions are known to members of the Government, the Speech from the Throne should contain some remedies for inland transportation.

Ample time was given. The House could have met and business been done long ago. The Speech from the Throne seems to have been caused by other things which have more seriously affected certain members of the Government. The Speech from the Throne was forgotten altogether, and that may account for the patchy way it was put together. I hope, Sir, that this is not an indication of the way work shall be done in this Assembly.

We have been promised some very wonderful things; I myself, have promised some very wonderful things and therefore I regret that the Speech from the Throne has been so clumsily put together.

I am glad to see the Department of Marine and Fisheries is going to receive some remodelling. I presume that the famous or infamous fish regulations (just as you please) will come up for consideration, and in connection with this I should like to speak of some of the phases of the regulations, and how they will effect some of the people in my dis-

trict. Year after year we have been drifting into business with Canada and the States. Fish merchants buy their fish on behalf of Canadian and American firms. They buy and sell direct or on commission. I wonder if the business of the people on the west coast is to be hung up until a permit can be obtained from St. John's to export their fish.

Supposing, as it is quite likely to happen, the buyers of fish will not give them the information, which they must give in order tc secure permits. I can quite understand Canadian or other firms having very serious objections to giving away their trade secrets, and apparently they must give away some of them before they can buy.

For the west coast this means that some of the men in the fish business will have to change their business or get out of it altogether if the regulations continue, and consequently I can see that the number of actual fishermen will greatly decrease. Already a great number of them have gone to Canada and the United States. It may be that we have too many men in the country. I hope that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will consider the peculiar methods of those connected with the fish business on the west coast in comparison with those on this side of the Island.

While I am on this matter of regulations regarding fish there is another matter pertaining to this debate. I refer to the war tax put on the export of fish from this country. Why the tax continued, I don't know. There is no excuse for it. One of the first things that should be done by the new government is the cancellation of this export duty.

I expected also, sir, in the speech from the throne something sensible in regard to the high cost of living which is a most pressing one in regard to this country. Men, women and children would be more interested to hear that something had been done in this particular than to hear that a certain department had been created or remodelled. The creation of departments absolutely means new taxation. perhaps some ingenious method may be dis covered by which taxation may be increased and the cost of living reduced. I am sure that not only the members but the whole country expected that some policy in connection with the high cost of living would be outlined. Read the history, sir, of any country that you will and you will find that it was always the question of food and the question of livelihood that drove people to desperation. I hope sir, that this omission if it is an omission, will be remedied, and if it is the studed pollcy of the government to ignore this question, then, Sir, I respectfully suggest that they think well and give great consideration to this matter before they decide upon such a question. The future generation of this country will not soon forget the men who comprising the Government of that day, so ignored the interests of the people to take the settlement of such questions into their own hands. That there is likelihood that such action will be taken, I say, because I believe it. It does not matter what part of this country you go to the grievance is that prices are going up and nothing is being done to stop it. Don't you think there is a breaking point? We, all of us, see that there is a point to which the people will be driven, but no further. We all of us, Sir, would regret that any such state of affairs might occur, but should it occur, I would not like to be one of those responsible for precipitating such a crisis. It was a question of bread; a question of the means of a livelihood, that precipitated the French revolution. The time came in that country

when the people decided they would get the food necessary to live, and the fact that to get it they had to cut off the head of a kind and a queen was a mere circumstance, a mere detail. There are those in power in this country to-day who do not consider the position of the people. Do they think, sir, that their position is so exalted that they are to be immune from the just condemnation of the people? Do they think, Sir, they are in some way sacrosanct. If so I would suggest, Sir, that they are living in a fool's paradise. I say that the people of this country are as the people of other countries, no better, no worse, just ordinary men, women and children. I know that at the present moment if something is not done, that the breaking point may come sooner than we anticipate. It is very easy to start this avalanche, for it will be an avalanche when the people resort to mob rule to rectify the evils that now exist in this country. It is easy to start this but it will be a difficult thing to control when it is started. This matter is one which is not likely to be passed over or brushed aside as something that one says, because one must say something.

I say, Sir, that those in authority if they do not soon do that which the people expect them to do, with regard to remedying conditions in this country, will be held responsible by the generations to come in this country, for having driven the people to do that which under other conditions they would never have done. The time may come, Sir, when owing to the conditions which daily become more severe, when the people of our country, than which I submit there is no people more law-abiding, the time may come when they may outdo those who at the present moment in certain parts of the continent of Europe are running things by mob rule. It is the most easy-going man who is often the most terrible when roused, and it may prove so with the people as well as with the Government, and in particular to the members of His Majesty's cabinet, that immediate steps be taken to deal in a fair way with those men who are responsible for the prevailing conditions.

There are, Sir, some points in connection with the Speech from the Throne that I would like to deal with, but I have already taken the time of this House too long. My excuse is that the matters which I have touched upon are essential matters which I must touch on if I am to do my duty to my constituents, and to the people of this country who elected me a member of this House. I must touch upon these and give my opinion of what I think the consequences of neglect may be.

I hope, Sir, that this promise, this pledge of the Prime Minister that immediately on resuming office he would deal with profiteers and profiteering is not one of these pre-election promises which nearly all of us make, and some of us have no intention of keeping. If the Government intend to remain inactive in this matter, I want to point out that when it comes to a question of its bread and butter this country will stand for no neglect.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Speaker, I first of all would like to tender my hearty congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the Reply to the Speech from the Throne. As I sat in my place on the opening day and looked across at the gentlemen in uniform. my mind drifted back to 1916 when I had the honor of moving the Address in Reply to the Speech with which the Assembly was then opened. If the debates were here you would find that in the last paragraph I expressed the wish that when the Assembly

was next called the war would be terminated and that some of the men who had enlisted would be here with us. What I wished for or predicted has come to pass. Both of these gentlemen are well worthy of any honor that may be conferred upon them by this or any House, and I want to congratulate them upon their splendid speeches.

I must say that so far as I am concerned the Speech from the Throne is a great disappointment to me and I feel that I am voicing sentiments of the great majority of the people when I say that it will be a disappointment to find in it nothing of the important matters referred to in the manifesto of the leader of the government. I presume the Speech from the Throne in a forecast of the olicy of the Government and if we are only to have these matters referred to in speech as the programe of the Govern ment's legislation while those which occupied such a prominent place in the manifesto of the Premier are to be now completely ignored than the people of this country will be betterly disappointed indeed.

The first matter referred to in His Excellency's speech is that of the ships given to this country by the Brit ish Admiralty and one would think from reading speech and from previous speakers a free gift made to us by Admiralty. This, sirs, is a false impression for these ships are the mose expensive that ever came to our shores. They were bought and paid for, not in dollars and cents it is true, but in the blood of the country's noble st and best and, I am sorry sir, if this is all the compensation we are to expect in a meterial way for the part our gallent men played in that awful conflict I do hope, however and confidently expect that when these ships come here and are put into commission that those gallant men of the Royal Newfoundland Regiment and Royal Naval Reserve will not be forgotten. There are many men I know who are fully qualified to take any or every position on these ships from captain to cabin boy and all of these are men who have gone through the great world war now so happily end ed.

In my own district of Placentia and St. Mary's alone I know several who are fully capable of navigating these steamers not alone in local but in foreign waters and it is only necessary for me to mention one of them, Capt. Sergt. Whelan, who has just arrived here from a foreign trip. He was one of the Blue Putties who went overseas in the early stages of the war and since coming back he has taken up navigation, fitted himself for a command and now he has return ed safely from a voyage acress the Atlantic. I just mentioned Capt. Whel an as an example of the men I refer to. I could name others and I hope the Government will see to it through the Marine and Fisheries Department or Shipping Department if that is still in existence at that time that these men are given a fair show.

The next item in the speech is the Labrador Boundary question which has been brought up and discussed in this Assembly for the past twenty years. It is a very vaxed question and if the Government in the interest of the Dominion can bring about a settlement of it they will be doing a very good thing but I trust that it will not merely become a means for some professional supporter of the Government or some lawyer to get a fat slice in the form of a cheque. I am also glad to notice that the winding up of the Militia Department is in contemplation, but I am sorry to say that at least I am not convinced that sufficient provision has been made for

the dependents of the noble boys who laid down their lives. Of course this matter has been under the jurisdiction of the Pension Board, but the Government should see to it that in not a single case is the widow or mother of our dead soldier lads left unprovided for. Numerous cases have come to my notice where the dependents of dead soldiers were treated with scandalous neglect, not only during this administration but in previous ones, and the principal reason why conscription became necessary in this country was the neglect of the dependents of those men who made it possible for us to have a Nfld. Regiment, and I believe that in this statement my honorable friends on the other side of the House who went across with the first five hundred will bear me out.

I am glad to notice in the Speech from the Throne the reference to Rev. Major Nangle already referred to by colleague, Mr. Sullivan and, like him I want to offer thanks on behalf of the people of my district to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for the interest displayed by him in the purchase of that sacred ground consecrated by the blood of so many of Newfoundland's brave sons and I regret that the respect for the necessary funds for this purpose did not meet with a more ready response. I do not believe that this was due to lack of interest or to the indifference of the people for I am sure that all will be too glad to contribute towards this splendid memorial.

The next item referred to in His Excellency's speech is our surplus revenue and right here I want to offer my hearty congradulations to the leader of the opposition, Sir M.P. Cashin who was in charge of our finances during the most trying period that ever was or ever will be experienced in this country, and I think, sir, that it reflects great credit on his ability that the Dominion, having accomplished what it did and paying for the many public services, was able to show such a substantial credit balance as that which was handed over to Hon. Mr. Brownrigg by Sir Michael last November.

Let me express the hope that his successor, Mr. Brownrigg, will meet with the same success; and if he has the luck or the misfortune to hold his office for a number of years, he may be able to leave it on the same sound financial basis as he found it.

The Department of Marine and Fisheries is to be reorganized I notice from the Speech from the Throne. This I greet with delight as I believe the time has now come for such action. This department is one of the most important in the colony. The staple has always been and will remain, the fishery. For the past fifty years we have been plodding along the same old rut, and perhaps the ordeal we are now going through for the marketing and sale of our fish may be a blessing in disguise. I am glad to see that it is the intention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to inaugurate some scientific methods for this important demartment. We are falling behind in this branch of our industries.

America, Scotland Norway, Canada and France have seen the value of their fisheries and have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars to promote them. Believe me you will find the people of this country ready to cooperate with the government for the betterment of conditions in relation to our fisheries.

Referring to the reorganization of the Marine and Fisheries Department, I express the hope that the Hon. Minister and I know that he has an honest desire t obenefit conditions generally for the fishermen he interested in, and I hope ample provision will be made for lights and alarms, so that

we may be able to safeguard the lives of our men who "go down to the sea in ships."

If either of you members would go to the Atlantic seaboard, or to Europe you would be ashamed to say that you are a member or a legislator for Newfoundland. Valuable lives are lost yearly. Every week newspapers print a tale of some vessel or punt or dory having gone on the rocks. If it were only the loss of the boat it would not matter so much. Up in my district many lives have been lost for lack of means to navigate. It is not my first time speaking in this house on this particular matter, but each time it has been passed over and other matters which seemed of more importance to the revenue have taken its place.

And now that the Hon. Mr. Coaker is consolidated into the important position of Minister of Marine and Fisheries let us hope that he will see that no more lives are lost through neglect I am glad also to notice in the Speech from the Throne that a proper survey of local vessels will be held. This is a move in the right direction. Had we proper surveys held in the past many valuable lives would have been saved. One particular case I intend to mention, which happened a few years ago. It is the case of the "Beverly" brought down here by some people. An old delapidated river boat. She was purchased in the United States, put on dock here, and had some repairs made. She was chartered by the firm of W. A. Munn to take a cargo of fish from Harbor Grace to Europe. I remember some of the men, one at least who was a constituent of mine, having thought the ship unseaworthy, left her and returned to St. John's. The men were arrested, brought to Harbor Grace and put on board the ship; but since she steamed out of that port she has been unheard of, and these valuable 23 or 24 lives have been sacrificed because we had no stringent examination.

There are, today, in this Dominion, orphans, because of the loss of this ship, which to my mind and to every honest member of this House and to the people of Newfoundland was criminal and scandalous neglect on the part of some person. I hope when this bill comes up it will be considered of utmost importance. I am also glad to know that the coastal boats will also be taken in on this survey.

(Copy missing here—8.45 to 9.00)

That before they would reach American coast so many would have met with watery graves. When the tragedy occurred the newspapers of every country were filled with accounts of the dreadful tragedy. Life saving aparatus that was caused to be put in use in every country, but it only lasted a short time. People soon forgot. Now I want to make the statement here tonight and I make it in all sincerity, I make it in the interests of the public, that if you were to go aboard any of the coastal boats tonight and asked to have the life boats tested, that they would not be twenty minutes in the water before they would sink, and the life buoys, if used, would only serve to drag a man down instead of keeping him up. We have no official whose duty it is to go aboard those boats and see that the lives of our people are being safeguarded.

Now this is a matter that I suggest the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries will take up and inquire into, and he will find that what I say tonight is correct. He may not find it correct in a week or a fortnight, for those people as soon as they hear the matter is up for discussion will have their boats made tight, and their life buoys thrown away and good ones put in their places. It is not that I

am anxious to have anyone prosecuted. My sole desire is that some morning we will take up the paper and read that a sad drowning accident has taken place in some part of the Island, and that even one life has been lost through neglect of this matter.

I notice also reference made in the Speech from the Throne to the Department of Postal Telegraphs, and another new Department of Education. With regard to the intention of the Government to re-organize the first named department I do not intend to deal tonight. I am prepared to give the new holder of that office a working chance. I know that the gentleman who occupied that office in the past was labouring under great difficulties for the prevailing conditions with regard to that important office he was not altogether to blame. I have no doubt that he did the best he possibly could under the circumstances and I don't know anything done in connection with that department that he could be held responsible for.

However, I do know, and do say without fear of contradiction that that department had been and is now to some extent rotten to the core, if I may be permitted to use the term. I know myself of cases of some o f my own constituents have had occasion to send large amounts of money from Placentia Bay, and I know of one particular case where the amount was very large was lost, and the registered letter, which was composed of cheques and bank bills, was traced from the west side of Placentia Bay to the General Post Office, and was then lost track of, and the only compensation the sender was offered was a ten dollar bill. We have from time immorial been recording great robberies, both in the city and in different parts of the outports, in connection with our registered letter and money order department. If the person who commits the crime has sufficient pull, the matter is winked out of sight, but if the crime is committed by some poor unfortunate, who has not any influential friends in church or state, we put him in jail. The only way to overcome that evil is to inaugurate a new system, and if you want to get honest service, give an honest wage, and make conditions such that the temptation to steal will be removed from these people, and this is the only way in public life and in business that anyone can get honest efficient help.

I notice, and I am glad to notice, that the Speech from the Throne states that the Government intends to grapple with the transportation trouble. Transportation by sea is one of the most important matters confronting the country at the present moment. Many parts of the coast line have not been served at all, and the coast line of our country in most cases is far removed from the railway.

There has been nothing done to increase the facilities for getting freight and mails from one place to another, and a number of places have been neglected where the inhabitants are paying their proportionate part towards the railways, and any other thing that is within their means. Some have the advantages of the railroad but no attempt is being made to give these people the service.

This is a matter that on more than one occasion I have done the best I could to convince this House should be rectified, and it is one of the matters that my colleagues and myself pledged ourselves to support, not only for our own district, but for all the districts in the Island. I am prepared, and I think I can speak for my colleagues, to give a hearty sup-

port to any member of this House, who is making an honest attempt to better conditions for the people who send him here, and I expect to get that same measure of support, for the district which I have the honour to represent.

As far back as 1913 when I first entered public life, I was then the junior candidate, on the authority of our leader promised the people of St. Mary's Bay, that a railway would be undertaken and completed, but no attempt has been made to carry out that promise. I want to exonerate the then leader who is now Lord Morris, and his associates in the council of that day, because we all remember in 1914 that horrible European war broke out, and no reasonable man, or no people of any district would be unreasonable enough to make a demand during the years of the war, that a large amount of money be spent on improvements at home. All the money available was required for more urgent necessities, and for this reason I myself, and those men who were associated with me at that time did not try to force the fulfilment of that contract, and though the hon. leader of this House did not pledge himself to his candidates, to build a railway in that section of the country.

I have confidence that if the matter of railway extension is brought before this House that sufficient support and sufficient sympathy will be given to the measure from the honourable gentlemen upon the other side. So far as the important Bay of St. Mary's is concerned, which from an agricultural standpoint is second to none in this Dominion, I would point out that by the building of a branch line up to this district you will open up an immense quantity of agricultural land, and at the present moment we have ample proof that agriculture must continue to receive all the support that this House can give it.

It may be judicious to depart from the present method but we cannot afford to shelve, and I do not say that it is the intention of the government to shelve, altogether this important department of agriculture. Right here in this city of St. John's to-day poor people are called upon to pay forty cents a gallon for half rotten potatoes. Now I consider that this is not good enough and I will refer to this matter a little later on.

As I said in the beginning of my effort, I am very, very sorry to notice the absence from this important document of so many proposed important measures, measures that were part and parcel of the manifesto as presented to the country last autumn by the hon. leader of the government, and, I might say, that I intended to refer to one or two of these items.

I consider, Mr. Speaker, that these items were of great importance and should have been embodied in this document, and the electorate of this country thought them of sufficient importance to vote for the men who promised them this very attractive change—reduction of taxation. This was one of the principal planks in the platform of the present government. There is no indication in the Speech from the Throne, no intimation given to this House and the country that this pledge is about to be carried out and there is no indication that any seriousness or any honesty was displayed by the gentlemen who made this promise.

I say, Mr. Speaker, it is not good enough to wait for the next session of the House or the following session or the final session before another general election to carry out that pledge. The people expect it now and

if it is not forthcoming the people of this country will become so disgusted with all politicians that the only safe attitude will be to lock these doors and send home the keys. The people are getting fed up with men going around this country through the several districts making all kinds of rash promises.

No doubt there are lots of promises made that the party who made them never intend even to attempt to carry out. I contend that a man who makes a promise and is not of honest desire and honest intention when he makes and does not intend to carry out his pledge is a criminal and should not be allowed a seat in this House to represent any constituency be he Prime Minister or any other man on any side of the House. Such men, sir, should be driven out of public life and I hope that when the driving out takes place that I will not be one of the ones to go.

This matter of reduction of taxation is a very serious matter and people are seriously expecting a reduction of taxation. When a barrel of flour is $16 or $20, as the case may be, and the man who wants one knows the store where he can get it and have the price everything is alright, but what if that barrel is more that the man can get or if he has not the money to purchase it and not a friend to lend him the money and he has a wife and several little children at home waiting for bread what is going to be the result?

The time is coming when such conditions may exist here. As has been so well stated here this evening by the hon. member of St. George's, bread has caused the massacre and destruction of many lives in Europe as well as those who died of starvation, and I shudder to think of what the result would be in this country if our people cannot get money to buy bread or buy the other commodities and necessaries of life that are required for their families. I know what I am talking about from personal experience and I know what it is to be without bread from personal experience though, thank God, it was not through poverty.

I remember the time, and perhaps my hon. friend, Capt. Jones, also remembers the occasion, that I intend to speak of. It happened some twenty-two years ago. At the time I was a resident of Little Bay, not many miles from Little Bay Islands, where Capt. Jones resides. On this particular occasion we had a very late Spring and the great number of people were employed in those days at the mines in Little Bay and people ran short of food. I do not say that we had money in abundance but we could manage to scrape enough to buy a stone of flour, but there was none to be had and we had to resort to eating peas and became as a substitute for bread. I remember that North of Tilt Cove and South to Twillingate and through all that large and important section of Notre Dame Bay that people were short of food. I shall never forget that memorable Sunday morning, June 22, when the S. S. Leopard arrived at Little Bay with relief. That picture is printed indelibly on my memory. I remember the clergymen and other prominent men at Little Bay who had lots of money and who were honourable enough to take ashore their bag of hard tack on the wharf and eat it there. You can picture it then what conditions were like in the homes of these poor people. Just picture the homes of some poor men and women of labour who were unable to buy a barrel of pork when first the shortage took place, whereas those who were blessed with the world's goods were in the position to pay the big

prices. This was a case not brought about by the extraordinary high prices that were asked. I think flour at that time was $5.00 and the best could be had at that figure before the shortage came on.

Now if we are not careful and if the present administration do not take hold and grapple with the high cost of living a serious condition of affairs is going to be brought about in this country. Any sane, sound and reasonable man must realize that some people are called upon to pay the enormous prices that are being exacted by those in business in the country at the present time. The climax must be reached some time and I am afraid that that some time is coming upon us. This matter may not appeal very strongly to some honourable members of this House because they have never been placed in the position similar to the one I have just now referred to and because a great number of them do not know what conditions are like in the houses and homes of the poor. There are people to-day in authority in this country who have been far remote all their lives from the humble sphere that I moved in and always liked to be in, and having moved in that sphere and having sprung from the common herd and the ranks of the workingman I think I am fully justified to express the condition of affairs that I know to exist, not alone in this city of St. John's, but in every harbor, settlement and cove both in the interior and along our coastline.

I notice that some time ago a commission was appointed to enquire into the High Cost of Living. It is absolutely nonsensical to appoint a commission; there's no necessity of making an enquiry. No reasonable or sensible man can see the need to enquire the high prices existing throughout the country is enough. There is commission enough. There is a class of man doing business in this country to-day who ought not be allowed to continue on in business. The increases, the unwarranted increases in numerous cases that have taken place with regard to provisions and groceries is enough in this great profiteering place and I hope my friend, the Honourable Minister of Marine and Fisheries will not forget the great work that he inaugurated which is of such great importance and that he won't forget the work that he started to do from the first session at which he sat of this House. And I hope he will not allow the circumstance of his being in business to interfere with the discharge of what I consider and of what he considers and what this House considers to be the duty of each and every individual of the House, and to see to it immediately. see that this scandalous profiteering be stopped. I saw a scale the other day sent out by some of the merchants telling what the working man should get. And what next will the merchant do when he comes to order how much the working man is going to pay for suits of clothers or a pair of boots and when he attempts to order what class of butter the working man shall bring to his table. If this is going to pass a serious condition of affairs will arise. I notice by the notice that the merchants say that twenty-six dollars will buy a suit of clothes for a man.

Now in all fairness, Mr. Speaker, is there a man in this House who would attempt to offer to his son or brother or some member of his family a suit of clothes for his best suit for which he paid twenty-six dollars? I do not consider myself to be one of the swells of the city but I am not able to purchase a suit which I would con-

sider fit to put on for less than sixty-five dollars to-day. Some pay as much as eighty or one hundred dollars for a suit and no doubt some of the honourable gentlemen here to-night are wearing suits which cost seventy or eighty dollars. That is the case.

Can any sensible man expect that the working man or fisherman is going to be satisfied with a suit of overalls for Sunday and that is all you can buy for twenty-six dollars. I do not mean to say that if the people got their just rights they would not be able to get a suit for twenty-six or thirty dollars.

Profiteering is already flourishing; men are fat and the more money they accumulate the more haughty they get in some cases. And they have fortified themselves so strongly against any interference and judging from the acquiescence of the people or at least the Government they are not going to be interfered with and they are allowed to go indefinitely until the people will rise in their might and instead of paytng twenty-six dollars for clothes or ten dollars for boots they will take them and then I suppose the machinery of the the law will be put into effect.

I submit Mr. Speaker, with all seriousness, that this matter is no joke and the people of the country will not consider it a joke, and while I have my voice I intend to use it on every occasion as much as I possibly can until those men who are committing scandalous crime of grinding down the poor on innumerable occasions and making enormous profits are justly punished. It reminds me of a story of a travelling man from St. John's some years ago who went to some part of the outports and he got in conversation with a business man of the outports where he was and he said "well skipper John what profits do you make upon your goods?" and John answered "sometimes I make one per cent," and he asked the travelling man:

"What do you make in St. John's?" and the travelling man answered: "Well, we would not think ourselves doing very much unless we made ten per cent. profit," and the travelling man said: "What, do you mean to tell me that you bring goods down here from St. John's, and then only make one per cent. profit; why, that would not pay for your telegrams or even the postage." So it transpired that some of these city merchants make one hundred per cent. An article that costs them fifty cents they sell for one dollar. And there are firms in this town to-day who are not satisfied with making one per cent. Articles are sold in this town for one hundred per cent. profit. And here we find a commission being appointed but only to make a farce of it. Surely there are some honest men in the country who have not sunk into the mire that they cannot rise to the defence of the poor working man who is being ground down to death. This is an important matter and should be gone into without a moment's delay. I intend to again speak on this matter of the High Cost of Living until I am absolutely satisfied that the Government is going to make a serious attempt to safeguard the interests of the people of Newfoundland. What difference does it make if it affects some party heeler or interferes with some financier. If you lose one friend you will make ten for the one you have lost.

If there were an approaching election I would forfeit my seat if necessary to see that the rights of the people were considered. I am not using this matter as a political weapon. And I pledge you my word of honor that I

would not only forfeit my seat, but would also give my wholehearted support to any honest effect that was being made to give just punishment to and lay the guilt upon those villianous and scandalous profiteers. On making this statement I do not know but when I arrive home on to-morrow that there will be a bill awaiting me at the house covering some money that I may owe and may be a case of "money up or shut up." I will not run away and prepare to go down to the lakeside if I have to do so for having fought in the defence of the people with whom I have lived all my life, and with whom I shall live the remainder, if it is short or long. Just one or two words more as there are a number of speakers to follow, and I do not intend to occupy the House more than a few minutes. I am sorry that no provision has been made for hospitable extention. This is a very grave matter and with which I have had experience during the last six years. And I am sure that other gentlemen who have been in the House for the past six or more years will also view the same way as I do.

It is a well known fact that the hospital accommodation is quite inadequate. I hoped that some reference would be made in the Speech from the Throne to outport hospitals. This is a very important matter, and cannot be given too much consideration.

During the term that I have been in the House, I have had as many as twenty people, patients for the hospital, some of extremely delicate health who had travelled several miles and on arrival here no bed could be found in the hospital for them. Sometimes these people have been placed in boarding houses, in some cases unfit for occupation by robust men, with food unfit for human consumption, and with rooms unventilated. This is no exaggeration. It is as true as gospel. Because of people being unable to get into the hospital valuable lives have been lost to this Dominion, and if by the expenditure of sufficient money to make an addition to the General Hospital or to build outport hospitals one life can be saved to the country, no matter how much money is spent, the taxpayers of the country will be glad to be taxed a small amount to provide this necessary accommodation.

There is another matter, Mr. Speaker, that I want to speak of, I want to call attention to the needs of the sick, and poor. This matter has come before this House before, has been brought to the attention of the members on other occasions. People coming in for operations have been put in a part of the baggage car, and have to undertake long journeys in agony and pain. This situation should be remedied by the co-operation of some person in charge of these matters. I understand that a new department in connection with the Department of Public Health is to be inaugurated. I hope it will be well thought out, and it comes before this House that it will be supported by every honourable member.

We know these conditions to exist, and should do everything in our power to overcome them. All of these matters only touch the fringe of what I would like to refer to. Many things I have had for the present to ignore. I do not mean to harshly criticise the present administration. I mean to be fair. I want to give a reasonable time to inaugurate the various matters to which I have referred. The time has not yet come. A new administration cannot do the things it would like to do in a few short months. But I want to serve notice on the Government that when the time come I will have no hesitation to call a spade a spade, to place the blame on the right shoulders. I will not hesitate to place any member in this House the charge of criminal neglect, if by his misconduct a

human life is lost to the country. I did not mean to speak so long when I got up, and as you will recognize, Mr. Speaker, my voice is not in very good trim. On some future date I will deal at greater length with these matters.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Speaker, allow me to avail of this opportunity to first of all to congratulate the two honourable gentlemen who have in such an excellent manner moved and seconded the address and in reply to the Speech from the Throne. When these gentlemen arose I anticipated that this Assembly was about to be favored with speeches of a very high order, and in nowise have my expectations not been fulfilled. I sincerely congratulate the hon. members for Burgeo and LaPoile and Bay de Verde. In every particular I think they are entitled to the highest commendation, and in tendering them my personal congratulations I am not unmindful of the fact that this is the first opportunity they have had of addressing this House.

In one sense I suppose I should voice an objection to the Speech from the Throne in these well known opposition words that for years have expressed the disapprobation which every Opposition feels more or less constrained to give expression to in regard to the first sessional utterances of the Government, namely, "that it is more remarkable for what it does not contain than for what it does contain." To be frank I might with much justification adapt these words, but in many respects I think the Speech from the Throne has much to commend it.

Dealing with the second paragraph I find there an expression that to my mind is pregnant with much meaning and bears a significance peculiarly its own, particularly in the light of the circumstances that have to a certain extent disturbed this country during the past few weeks. The words to which I refer are "I cannot avoid impressing upon you the lesson of all history that a great convulsion is followed by much unrest and that all our patience and sympathy will be required to realize under the guidance of Divine Providence a permanent peace upon earth and goodwill to all formerly warring nations."

Appreciating the wisdom that lies behind these words I realize that they have application to this country as well as to the larger countries of the world and that we should never forget their import when we realize that a first duty is incumbent upon us of cultivating in the best possible manner a spirit of patience and sympathy in our people that will aid us to prevent Newfoundland from being visited with that condition of unrest which may perhaps enter amongst our people during the period that we are now entering upon. But may I ask how far does the policy of the Government thus far justify the pious sentiments expressed in the words that I have quoted? How far has the attitude of the Government been to sooth our people and allay fears and suspicions on their part and make them realize that the Government whom they elected to office last November has a thorough realization of its responsibilities to its people not alone from the view point of administrators of the public trust, protectors of our commonwealth and national interests but as the formulaters of public thought and the sponsors of public morals. I have in mind now the circumstances under which the Leader of this House has allowed himself to be publicly charged with the commission of a grave offence and for the past few weeks has made no attempt to clear himself of the allegations that have been made against him. I am surprised that the hon. gentleman implicated in this matter has not realized that not alone does he owe a duty to

himself to see that his name is cleared from the stigma that must of necessity attach to it if the charges against him are not contradicted, but as the Prime Minister of this Dominion he symbolizes in his person and in his actions the ideals of a people; and has incumbent upon him the responsibility of seeing that not alone does he not bring discredit upon the high office to which he has been elected, but that he rests under no suspicion of doing anything that would tend to lower him in the estimation of the people or give room for doubt that his endeavours are centred on his protecting to the fullest extent public honour and public trust and the preservation of these standards of public decency of which he is the symbol as well as the custodian. Unfortunately he has seen well to remain silent under the charges that have been made against him and so long did he continue in this course that it remained for the public of this city at a public meeting to pass a resolution petitioning H. E. the Governor to institute enquiries into all the circumstances of the charges that have been made against the hon. gentleman concerned. In that case I think it is particularly regretable that the public was forced in their own interest to take this stand but I regard it as most reprehensible that if the Prime Minister did not regard it as a duty on his part to immediately clear himself from the allegations that have been laid against him that the Government as a whole did not see the necessity for prompt investigation of a matter of such importance and gravity; and further I regard it as most reprehensible that despite earnest appeals, despite public protests, despite all the public attempts that have been made to have this matter thoroughly investigated that no attempt has been made to do anything. Complete indifference on the part of the Government has been shown towards the feelings of the people in this respect. In my opinion this is not the way to inculcate that spirit of patience and sympathy to which the Speech from the Throne refers, nor is it in this manner that the Government can hope to convince the people of the sincerity of such pious, but I fear unctuous, sentiments. My remarks, be it clearly understood are not directed towards any particular department of the Government. I offer my honourable friend, the Minister of Justice, no fulsome flattery when I say that there is none I would trust more implicity than himself to see that so far as in him lies no public rights are left unprotected. He has told us that he took an early opportunity to go into these charges and this, Sir, I am sure, reflects great credit upon him.

He has also told us of his having conferred with eminent legal authority in England upon the matter of the charges contained in what the Hon. Prime Minister has seen fit to designate as the "St. Patrick's Day Affidavit" and that the advice derived from this source confirmed him in the conclusion that even if these charges were proven true there was nothing criminal in them, and for that reason the Hon. Minister has seen fit not to put the machinery of the law in force. It is understood a Royal Commission has now, however, been appointed, not alone to inquire into the immediate charges of this affidavit but to cover a period of years and we have it from the Hon. the Leader of the Government himself that this inquiry will be a grand inquest of the Colony. It will go back, we are told, ten or fifteen years and take into review all the commissions and omissions of public men thruout that period. Now, Sir, I ask you if that is what the people have demanded. We all know that it is not. The

public meeting the other night was to the effect that certain specific charges be investigated and now we are informed that the Commission appointed will extend its activities and bring within its scope the supposed misdoings of public men for many years past. In any case the position is this that altho these charges are contained in the sworn statement of a former Minister of the Crown, no action whatever has been taken except as the Minister of Justice has told us to endeavour to determine whether or not the offence involved is criminal, but Sir, the matter of criminality or uncriminality is of absolutely no moment and the opinion English legal authority, average or eminent is but a mere obiter dictum and has no effect as far as the main issue is concerned. We have under Responsible Government, a judiciary of our own and if there are allegations of this nature to be dealt with the way to do it is to institute the proper proceedings and have the matter adjudicated upon by our own courts. I understand much has been made of the contention that the allegations, even if true, made against the Hon. the Leader of the Government, do not consititute any criminal charges against him. That is a matter of very little moment. It may be a moot point as to whether or not the English Act which constitutes it an offence to be parties to an unlawful agreement for the withdrawal of an election petition has application in this country, but on the assumption that it is not a criminal act, in the ordinary acceptation of the word I think that an act such as that charged against the Hon. Leader of the Government is one against public morals and public decency, and in that respect is one the serious consequences of which we cannot pay too much attention to.

Now let me paint the other side of the shield. A few days ago information was laid against certain sealers of the crew of one of our local sealing vessels. The facts of the case being as follows: The men left port to prosecute the voyage in the knowledge that the voyage was to terminate on the 15th April. They fitted themselves out for that length of time, and the ship's stores and supplies were regulated accordingly. The sealing venture was a failure and on or about the 7th April a suggestion was made to the men that they continue the voyage beyond the prescribed date in the hope that the voyage would not altogether prove unremunerative. The men realizing the loss they had met up to that date and the apparent futility of continuing any further, the necessity for getting back to their avocations at home in the hope of doing something to compensate them for the severe loss which had been occasioned them, knowing that the ship was not fitted out for a longer voyage ,and for other reasons all valid and substantial, declined to coincide with the suggestion,—informed the captain to this effect and accordingly on the 15th day of April refused to further continue the voyage and notified the captain accordingly. There was no attempt at mutiny or disorder of any kind. It was merely a peaceful but firm insistance on the part of the men that their rights be protected; and in the light of the facts of the case one could not come to any other conclusion than that the men were well within their rights. No trouble of any kind was occasioned the captain or officers. The men worked the ship to port and in all respects properly conducted themselves, as the captain himself admitted. Upon their arrival in port proceedings were commenced against them under the "Merchant Shipping Act." I had the privilege of defending the men. They were acquitted of the charges against them and the information dismissed, where-

upon fresh proceedings were taken against them under another Statute the Master and Servants Act, but in this case, not content with the ordinary process by way of summons, the prosecution saw well to have the men arrested and taken from their homes and lodged in jail. Thanks to the good offices of certain of the authorities the freedom of the men was obtained after a short period of detention and the following day the case was heard with the result that they were again acquitted and the information dismissed.

Now look at the contrast between these cases and the case of the Hon. the Prime Minister. In the former the men were proceeded against under an Act that clearly did not apply to them and when the court before whom they were tried decided to this effect proceedings were laid against them and they were arrested under another Act, the application of which—to say the least—was in grave doubt . What precautions were taken on behalf of these men to see that their liberties were not interfered with unnecessarily or unjustly? What precaution was taken in the case of these men to see that they were not proceeded against under an Act which had no application to their alleged offences? What precautions were taken to place beyond all doubt the criminality or absence of criminality of the acts before a prosecution was commenced against them. Did the law officers of the Crown do everything possible to satisfy themselves that these men were being properly proceeded against? Was the opinion of eminent counsel in England first obtained before a prosecution was allowed to be instituted against them? We know that all this was done in the case of the Prime Minister, but was it done in the case of these ordinary men —men whom politicians are wont to describe as the bone and sinew of our country on the eve of an election, but men whose liberties and rights seem to be of the most trifling importance when their political usefulness for the time being is over.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—May I ask, Mr. Speaker, do I understand my hon. friend to say that the Dept. of Justice had anything to do with the arrest of these men?

MR. FOX:—I am coming to that. We know that the same precautions taken by the Dept. of Justice in regard to the charges alleged against the Hon. the Prime Minister were not taken in regard to the charges against these sealers to whom I am referring. It is true the prosecution was not conducted by the Hon. Minister of Justice, nor his Department, nor were these men arrested by his behest in the actual sense, although technically his department was supposed to have entire cognizance of the matter, and must take responsibility for what the officials under his charge did in the premises. He may very well reply that precautions of the nature that I have referred to were unnecessary and that these proceedings were and had a right to be allowed to be carried out in the ordinary normal unfettered fashion, but then may I ask him why were such extraordinary measures of protection and precaution undertaken on behalf of the Hon. the Prime Minister and not taken in the case of these sealers. Why allow any such difference to exist in the administration of justice. Is it any wonder that the idea is abroad that there is one law for the rich and one for the poor? Is there no room for the conclusion that the difference between the treatment accorded these men and the treatment accorded the Hon. Leader of the Government exists because of the difference that exists in the social and political status of the parties concerned. I say Sir that if those in authority are to retain the respect and confidence of

the people such conditions cannot be permitted to continue. We shall never be able to inculcate the spirit of patience and sympathy referred to in the Speech from the Throne unless we realize that all the citizens of this country are entitled to the same protection, and the rights of no class are to be preferred to the rights of another, but the same sacred regard for their liberties and their privileges must be accorded each and all on the great principle of justice and equality that should underly the administration of the public affairs of this or any other Dominion of the Crown.

I am sure the people generally will appreciate the donation by the British Admiralty to Newfoundland of two ships heretofore used for naval purposes, and that the action of the Government in purchasing a third ship from the Admiralty for coast protection purposes will be amply justified. I am glad to note that these ships will be utilized in connection with such services as the light house department and general emergency and rescue purposes. I have long considered it absolutely necessary that the Government should have at its immediate disposal a fast boat that could render effective rescue service at any time required. Lessons of recent years should be all too well impressed upon us; and surely it is time for us to learn that valuable lives may be saved and valuable property protected in this manner. I am hopeful that these boats will be used in connection with a more perfect coastal protection service around Cape Race, St. Shotts and vicinity, the necessity for which I will refer to later on in my remarks. I understand that the gift of these two vessels was made possible by the activities of the late Government and plans for the purchase of the third ship were concluded before the present Government came in office. I feel sure the present administration will not withhold from its predecessors in office due credit for their activities in these directions.

I am glad to note that at last something definite has been done in connection with the Newfoundland boundary dispute. The finalization of this matter unfortunately has been delayed all too long and one of the results has been that Newfoundland has lost the benefit of the development of its forest resources on the Labrador Peninsula, because capitalists would not seriously consider developing these areas while the title of the Newfoundland Government was enshrouded in any doubt. Competent authorities have passed upon the potential earning powers of these areas and I think the statement goes unchallenged that in its possession of this peninsula Newfoundland has mineral and forest resources and water powers of inestimable value. I think the greatest attention should be paid to the protection of this very valuable portion of Newfoundland's territory; and I am glad to think that Newfoundland's case will have the advantage of the attention and care of my learned and honourable friend, the Minister of Justice, than whom none could be found more capable or efficient to protect in every respect the rights of this dominion.

I note that the Government intends to wind up the Dept. of Militia and the Dept. of Shipping at the earliest possible moment and steps are being taken to inaugurate a more efficient service for the benefit of our disabled soldiers and sailors. Reference has been made to the work of the Civil Re-establishment Committee and I am sure that the public generally will acknowledge the deep debt of gratitude Newfoundland is under to these gentlemen for their voluntary and extremely valuable services performed in the interest of these brave men in our Dominion who sacrificed so much and suffered so greatly

in our common cause. Looking back upon the record of the Department of Militia we should always remember that this branch of our service was inaugurated at a time when the stress of war demanded that everything be done with the utmost expedition; that Newfoundland had no precedent of her own to follow; and if in the beginning mistakes were made that criticism on that account should not be levelled against any individual or against the administration then in charge of the affairs of the Colony, because mistakes were inevitable. When we think of the great work this department undertook and carried out so well we have to admit that the greatest credit is due my honourable associate Mr. Bennett and his colleagues for the capable, efficient and praiseworthy work they did in this department. They were pioneers in a service of this character and their record from beginning to end reflects the very highest credit upon them.

I come now to that paragraph in the Speech from the Throne upon which may well be focused all our attention and which cannot be read without awakening thoughts and stiring up memories of the proudest, if saddest, episode in the history of our country. The paragraph I refer to is that one which deals with the concentration and registration of the graves of our heroic dead in Europe and the erection of suitable war memorials on sites purchased by the Newfoundland Government. It is gratifying to think that that valorous and Christian gentleman Rev. Major Nangle has charge of this work. Apart from his intimate knowledge of the various battle fronts over which the Newfoundland Regiment fought and the fund of information that he has at his disposal in reference to the resting places of our dead soldiers in France and Belgium, it is very fitting in my opinion that he should be appointed to take charge of this undertaking, because he symbolizes in the fullest possible sense the sentiments of patriotism, chivalry, devotion to duty and unselfish heroism that have signalized the record of the Newfoundland Regiment and have been epitomized in that title which they so deservedly won of "Better than the Best."

And when I speak on that subject and think of the glorious record our soldiers left behind them and the honour they brought their country, and think of the unselfish and devoted labours of this zealous Padre who with his confreres in arms the Rev. (Capt.) Clayton and the Rev. (Capt.) Stenlake and of the praiseworthy manner in which these gentlemen professing different creeds led the men of our famous regiment along the paths of Christian charity and brotherly love, and in devotion to our common cause sunk all differences of religion in their magnificently successful endeavor to unify the men whose moral guardians they were into a brotherhood that knows not class nor creed nor race, but only the common purpose that binds them together, I am reminded of the terrible evil that is doing so much to embitter feelings in Nfld. to-day and destroy that spirit of harmony, peace and goodfellowship that should exist amongst us. I refer now to that scourge of sectarianism beginning at the eve of the general elections last fall and assuming such proportions as are a menace, as well as a disgrace, to any decent country possessing a decent minded citizenry. When the glorious, if tragic, story of Newfoundland's record in the war was being told it was imagined that example of our soldiers would never be lost sight of. It was felt that the ideals they were fighting for—and fighting for so well—would ever remain a proud possession of Newfoundland, to be looked up to, treasured and followed through all the succeeding

years. These men on the battle fields of France and Flanders fought as one and considered not class nor creed. They fought with a common aim—the success of the great cause they were espousing—and registered their blows regardless of the colour or religion of the men who fought side by side with them. They were united and under no circumstances did the question of religious difference ever arise amongst them. The duty laid upon their shoulders was a noble one and under Providence they fought and won as men inspired with such noble sentiments such as they were, were bound to fight and win. They looked to their religion and found therein not a source of dissension and discord, but a fountain of solace and comfort. Their record is an example to us, but how far have we followed it? How far have we as public men allowed ourselves to lose sight of it? I consider the time is now opportune when we should seriously and honestly take cognizance of this dread evil sectarianism which, so contrary to the example set us by these men who went overseas and sacrificed so much for us, we are allowing to go unchecked throughout this country, inoculating every section of this Dominion wits its deadly virus. I have given serious attention to this matter, particularly in view of the unabated vigour with which it is allowed to pursue its evil course, and I have come to the conclusion that there is only one way of ridding this country of it, and that is to appeal to all sections of the community to come together and see that this vicious Thing is no longer allowed to hold sway over the people of Newfoundland, but that we rid ourselves of it promptly and forever. In this spirit I have conceived it my duty to speak to-night and to appeal to the gentlemen of this honorable Assembly who are in a great measure the leaders of their people, the guardians of their morals, formulators of their truths and the conservators of the peace and harmony that should exist amongst them to join with me in the attempt to which I am now directing my attention. A general election unfortunately is always prolific of injurious sentiments that tend to embitter public and private feelings, but rarely as a consequence have we had to face such a lamentable state of affairs as that which is all too present in this country to-day. It has never been my misfortune to have heard and seen religion and the holiest and most sacred thoughts connected with it brazenly flaunted before the people in an attempt to inflame their feelings and give life to their prejudices, as I have seen and heard since the early days of last Autumn. We know the result,—that the most sacred ideals of an otherwise loveable people,—because even amongst ourselves we must admit that Newfoundlanders as a whole are loveable, law-abiding people with a strong sense of Christianity and neighborly feelings amongst them, and who if left alone would continue to live in harmony and goodfellowship, but as things are to-day are separated and deliberately kept separated because of the evil of certain evil-minded politicians—are being prostituted by men whose ambition prompts them to utilize every means available to place themselves and retain themselves in power, and whose disordered senses prompt them to go as far as to drag down to the most sordid depths the most precious sentiments of a people whom they are doing so much to ruin. We as representatives of our people must always remember that when we come upon the floors of this chamber we do not come as representatives of any particular denomination, but as representatives of the people; when we subscribe to the oath of allegiance and

take our places here we have to put even the interests of our own respective constituencies behind us, if these interests conflict with the interests of the general public of Newfoundland; that a solemn duty is incumbent upon us of not alone enacting laws for the better material government of this country, but of so comporting ourselves and conforming to high ideals of decent citizenship that the moral standards of our people will never be lowered and that the precepts that we are wont to preach of brotherly love and Christian charity are exemplified in our own public conduct. Newfoundland can never hope to prosper if it continues to be divided on sectarian lines. We all know the old adage that "a house divided falls." No government can possibly hope to attain real success unless as a result of its governing all classes and sections of the country are welded as one and recognition and representation given to the wishes and feelings of even the most isolated portion of the community. Government must be government of the people, by the people and for the people, and the governing authorities of a country who allow a condition of affairs to obtain which cannot result in the advancement of that principle, and who tolerate a pro paganda which has for its object the religious disememberment of the country they seek to govern, must realize that they face failure, either immediately or eventually, it matters not, for failure must come. In my opinion the man who would descend to the disgraceful tactics and the unholy propaganda practised and utilized by certain of our public men in this Dominion, particularly for the past eight or ten months ought be hounded out of public life. If we are content to allow this unholy and highly disgraceful state of affairs to continue we must be prepared to take full responsibility and face the condemnation of all proper thinking people, with its consequent disaster to us when the day comes for us to render an account of our stewardship. Newfoundland's progress is being stopped because of the unrest and the dissension that are being engendered by the spirit of sectarianism which is rampant in Newfoundland to-day; and we cannot hope to prosper or hope to have our country advance or ourselves succeed in our public trust, if the evil influences of this insidious propaganda are not immediately counteracted. I say that it is a sacrilege for any man to play upon the religious feelings of another to further his own end. I appeal to this House, I appeal to the public to save Newfoundland, because I regard the conditions prevailing to-day as highly demoralizing. I do not blame the people as a whole, but I certainly blame the individual who goes amongst these people and deliberately rises their passions and prejudices in the way I have indicated.

It is pleasing to note that the revenue for the last year showed a substantial surplus over expenditure. The credit for this must, of course, be given to my leader Sir Michael Cashin, who in his position as Finance Minister so capably and efficiently carried out the duties of that high office and achieved the finest record that any Finance Minister of this country has ever reached. Newfoundland's finances were never in such a satisfactory condition as during his administration and the greatest possible praise should be accorded him for the wisdom and efficiency with which he administered the financial affairs of this colony during his long tenure of office.

I notice that the estimates will be subject to considerable revision. I trust that any revision decided upon will be in accordance with the pre-elec-

tion promises of the Government and be the complement of the manifesto of the honourable the Leader of this House. It will be interesting to watch and note affairs in this direction, and whether, now that the time has come for proof, the Government will give evi dence of the sincerity of its protesta_ tion of reform and reduction of taxa- tion upon which it went to the country last fall.

Dealing with the Dept. of Marine and Fisheries, I am glad that serious consideration will be given to placing that department upon a scientific basis. It has long surprised me that Newfoundland with such immense fishery resources and such potential earning power never considered the scientific investigation and development of this industry. Perhaps no other country in the world can claim such little knowledge of its staple industry as Newfoundland. When we consider that we are in main absolutely dependent upon the success of our fisheries, what excuse can we offer if our conduct shows that we are indifferent to their proper development and scientific treatment? Every other fishing country of the world has set itself seriously to the task of placing this important matter upon a thoroughly efficient basis and I am glad to think that Newfoundland is about to follow suit. I believe that if this movement is carried out as it should be it will result in a marked improvement in our staple industry and Newfoundland will gain immeasurably through this assistance unfortunately so long delayed.

The next paragraph of the Speech from the Throne says that Legislation will be introduced to establish a proper survey of ships in Newfoundland and of all vessels engaged in the foreign trade of the island. This legislation will include provision for the protection of the lives of all those employed on foreign going vessels. There can be no question as to the wisdom of this course. Our maritime laws have for all too long a period been disregarded and it is time that some such step be taken. In this connection let me refer to the comment that was made by an honourable member of this Assembly in reference to the loss o fthe S.S. "Beverley." Merely as a matter of inference it might appear that his speech contained some criticism of the owner of that vessel Mr. W. A. Munn. In justice to Mr. Munn I would like to clear up the situation and emphazise the fact that no censure of any sort can be laid on him or blame of any description accorded him. He was not the original owner of the vessel in question, but purchased it from a local firm who had bought the ship outside the country and brought it here and spent considerable money in effecting repairs. In addition to the work of renovation and reconstruction carried out by the original owners in this country Mr. Munn went further and gave carte blanche to the naval architects in charge to do everything necessary to render that vessel seaworthy and in all respects fit to take up trans_Atlantic cargo work. He spent money lavishly on her reconstruction and repair. He gave the widest authority to the men responsibile for the work and the most explicit instructions to leave nothing undone to put her in proper condition and safeguard every possible contingency. From the time he became owner of that vessel up to the time she left Newfoundland no effort was spared by Mr. Munn in a conscientious endeavour to perform his obligation as owner. Every precaution possible was taken, every safeguard availed of, and Mr. Munn can in nowise be blamed for the loss that overtook this ship. When the news of her loss reached this country no one in the country felt more deeply the loss of the lives on board that vessel than Mr. Munn; and it is

most unjust and most unfair to blame him even in the slightest fashion for the marine tragedy known as "the loss of the S.S. 'Beverley.'" I say this in justice to this gentleman, and I feel sure that every person who knows the circumsfances surrounding the purchase, reconstruction and loss of this steamer will save Mr. Munn harmless of any responsibility for this heart-rending fatality.

I regard the legislative enactment dealing with our coastal services as both very wise and very essential. We know from actual knowledge that it is only the mercy of Providence that has averted many disasters in the past on the South Coast of Newfoundland. In the spring and fall of every year vessels go to and from Labrador and the Straits overloaded and overcrowded, and it is not due to the care and protection of the authorities or those responsible for the carrying out of the laws on the subject that tragedies have not overtaken the voyages of these vessels. I know that small schooners unsound and unseaworthy have been employed to convey men from the Labrador to Newfoundland. I fear that many of the rules and regulations dealing with survey of ships, coastal and otherwise, and the scrutiny of life-saving appliances, and generally the protection of those who go on board these vessels have been carried out in a very lax fashion. The captain and officers of these vessels cannot be held blameworthy. I have spoken to several of them and they themselves have decried the intolerable conditions under which they are forced to carry out these services. Idoubt very much if ever, supposing these vessels carry life boats or other life_saving appliances, this apparatus is tested, or whether it is ever demonstrated that in time of accident it might be depended upon to safeguard the lives of passengers and crews. I consider that the circumstances surrounding these services are nothing short of monstrous, and it is incumbent upon the authorities to immediately take remedial measures and to see that this intolerable state of affairs is not allowed to continue any longer. Dealing with this question I would also like to refer to the revision of the sealing laws.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—Mr. Speaker, as the hour is now late and as I have some rather lengthy observations to make on the Speech from the Throne, I shall reserve them for the next sitting, and I therefore move that the House do now adjourn.

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

Second reading of bill entitled "An Act respecting the effect and application of certain act subsequent to Consolidated Statutes (Third Series).

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the effect and application of certain acts subsequent to Consolidated Statutes (Third Series)" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole house on to-morrow.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this bill I wish to say that it is of more interest to the legal than the lay section of the House. The idea of the bill is to legalize certain acts passed since the compilation of the Consolidated Statutes, (Third Series) in 1916.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the bill entitled "An Act to amend the Industrial Societies Act, 1919" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the whole House on to-morrow.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUS-

TICE:—Mr. Speaker, this is another bill of a purely technical nature, and deals with co-operative concerns and industrial societies providing for the Department of Justice to be empowered to make rules and regualtions instead of the Registrar of Deeds and Companies whose duty this was under the act as it formerly existed.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act to amend Cap. 41, of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Newfoundland Medical Board" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole house to-morrow.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Speaker, perhaps if my friend the honorable member for Hr. Main had been in the House before he would have had charge of this bill. The present Act provides that practitioners seeking to take out a license must take an examination for which a fee of twenty-five dollars is charged. I understand that the doctors now desire to raise this fee to forty dollars.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the bill entitled "An Act to amend the Food Control Act, 1917" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole house on to-morrow.

HON. THE PREMIER:—In moving the second reading of this bill, Mr. Speaker, I may say that in 1917 an Act was passed providing for the control of certain import trade. Under this the Board was composed of three members and this amendment is for the purpose of increasing the personel to six. The second section of this bill deals with Sec. 6, of the 1917 Act, which is amended to read.

MR. HIGGINS:—May I ask Mr. Speaker, if the members of the Food Control Board are paid?

HON. THE PREMIER:—No provision for payment has been made for the present members of the Board who have up to the present given their services gratis though I understand the late members were paid. These were Sir Patrick McGrath, chairman, Mr. H. W. LeMessurier and Mr. George Grimes. The present personnel is Hon. A. W. Mews, chairman, Mr. LeMessurier, the late President of the Board of Trade, the President of the L.S.P.U., the President of the N.I.W.A.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the bill entitled "An Act respecting the Department of Public Works" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole house to-morrow.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

Honourable the Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 176 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series), entitled "Of the encouragement of Ship Building."

Sir M. P. Cashin gave notice of question.

HON. THE PREMIER:—Mr. Speaker, in answer to a question asked on Wednesday, I beg to say that one of the ships secured by this Colony from the British Admiralty was purchased for 15,000 pounds sterling. The others are a donation from the British Government, only whatever fittings might be necessary and the cost of bringing the ships out here to be paid for by our Government.

The House then adjourned till Monday at 3 p.m.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises, it adjourn until Monday next at 3 o'clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, April 26th, 1920.

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

Mr. Sullivan gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Walsh gave Notice of Question.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 176 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Encouragement of Shipbuilding" was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on tomorrow.

The debate on the Address in Reply was resumed.

PETITIONS

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Patrick's Cove on the Cape Shore asking for telephone or telegraph communication. The petition is signed by George McGrath and all the other residents of this settlement. This is not the first time that this important matter has come before this House in the form of petitions nor is it the first time that I have tried to have this boon granted to the people who now ask for it. Patrick's Cove is situated about mid way between Placentia and Branch or about twenty miles from each place and under present conditions the people suffer great hardship because of their isolated condition. It would be an easy matter for the Government to establish telephone communication there and as there is no coastal service or no railway connection the people are fully entitled to this consideration. The fishery is usually good there and there are splendid agricultural possibilities but the lack of facilities nullifies the good effects of all this. The time has now come when we must look these matters straight in the face and I am sure that the Government will do their best to see that the request of this petititon is granted. The telegraph line now runs along the shore for a distance of forty miles, and if the telegraph were cut out altogether and a telephone system installed, the cost would not be as great as at present. I may say that the late Government made recommendations to the colonial secretary's department on the matter of telephone connection in this section and Patrick's Cove was one of the places that were to be considered. Some of the offices were built and tenders were asked for for the others. I have no doubt mut that the present government will continue the good work. I feel sure that the minister of posts and telegraphs will see that this petioion will be given the consideration that its importance demands. I have much pleasure, sir, in presenting the petition and asking that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in giving this petition my hearty support. We had arrangements practically complete for the opening of this office, and I know that the Government will see that the work is carried out. It would be in the best interests of the majority of the people of this section if the telegraph was cut out and a telephone system submitted for it, as then every little hamlet could be connected up at very little cost, and in this way many lives could be saved.

MR. SINNOTT:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to also give this petition my hearty support.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Speaker, just one other petition this afternoon. This is a very lengthy one as you can see, and it is signed by some two hundred people. It is from the

residents of Colinet Island, asking for the sum of $15,000 to open up a canal and build a breakwater. These people have no good harbor and suffer unnecessary hardships in carrying on their work. The request is a reasonable one, and I am sure that it will receive the best support of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. These people do not participate in the many other public services which they help to pay for. They have no coastal service although it is true that a steamer calls at Salmonier, but this is a long distance away. I think that this petition should receive sympathy and practical sympathy, and I have much pleasure in referring it to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in giving this petition my full support. Those people are isolated in the middle of St. Mary's Bay and the improvements they ask for would be a great advantage to them. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I trust that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will give the petition his hearty support.

MR. SINNOTT:—It gives me much pleasure, Sir, to give this petition my full support.

MR. TARGETT—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of the south side of Trinity Bay, asking that Magistrate J. W. Janes be transferred to the south side or the bay. In consideration of the part this man played in the great war I think that he should be the man chosen if anybody for this important appointment. He gave three sons and a daughter to the forces, one of whom made the supreme sacrifice. As regards the needs of a magistrate on the south side of Trinity Bay, I cannot too greatly urge upon this house the importance of the request of this petition. For a magistrate to come from Broad Cove to Hant's Harbor means that he has to travel 23 miles, and it is not every day or every month or every two months that he is able to make the journey. It seems a strange thing to me that all the magistrates should be situated in Conception Bay, but I suppose that politics is accountable for it. There is a settlement be- Heart's Content called Winterton, and when the magistrate comes from Carbonear to Heart's Content the people, whether male or female, who have any business to be settled, must travel to Heart's Content in all kinds of we ather. I trust that this house and the department of justice will take these facts into consideration and that the prayer of this petition will be granted.

MR. GUPPY—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in giving this petition my hearty support.

Mr. HIGGINS—Mr. Speaker, somehow or other I have, during the past two or three sessions had occasion to support a petition of this kind. I have personal knowledge of the difficulties with which these people have to contend in magisterial matters, and I support the petition for the reason that the gentleman referred to should, on account of his splendid war record, be given every consideration. I feel sure that the Department of Justice will give this matter serious consideration, and I have much pleasure, Sir, in giving the petition my hearty support.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of the people of Flatrock on the matter of a concrete road. As its name implies, Flatrock was intended by nature to have a concrete road. The launchway built there by the late government was found to give great satisfaction, but this has been washed away. The public wharf has also been washed away. I think it will be found when inquired into by the Marine and Fisheries Department that this is a very urgent need. By

reason of the importance of this settlement and the amount of fish it brings in yearly, I feel satisfied that the results of any investigation of the Marine Department will justify the building of this concrete road. I support this petition most heartily, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Speaker, I would like to support my hon. colleague in this petition. I know the value of concrete works of a similar nature in other settlements, and the necessity of this road in Flatrock. I therefore beg leave to support this petition.

MR. VINICOMBE:—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting this petition of my hon. colleague, Mr. Higgins. I think the late government put some concrete on the road there and it stood the wear and tear of time for the past few years. The present Government will find no better men than the fishermen of Flatrock, and no doubt they deserve this concrete road. Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting this petition.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Shoe Cove,a small settlement near Pouch Cove, for a way house where the mail may be dropped. The request asks that the mail be left at tne house of Thomas Power. This does not require anything more than the halting of the mail team on its way to Pouch Cove. This will save the people of Shoe Cove a two mile walk and the expenditure will be nominal. I will ask the Hon. Prime Minister as Colonial Secretary to give this petition his serious consideration.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Speaker, I should like to support the petition and I feel sure that the prayer of this petition will be granted. I ask the Hon. Prime Minister that this petition receive his consideration.

MR. VINICOMBE:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to support this petition from the people of Shoe Cove, as I realize the necessity for such a way house.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Notice of Questions.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—Mr. Speaker, I have read the Governor's Speech from the Throne with considerable interest. It is not what is in the Speech that is interesting; it is what is left out. One part of the Speech I am fully in accord with, and that is we are all proud the great world war is over and we are settling down to peace. I am proud to welcome Lieut. Small and Sergt. LeGrow to the House and fully realize the great work they have done, and the noble boys who laid down their lives for the greatest nation in the world, upon which the sun never sets. The only Crosbie who was fit to volunteer did so—my nephew, at 16 years of age—and was killed in the great drive of July, in which so many of Newfoundland's sons laid down their lives. We are proud of them one and all. When reading the Speech I came to one of the most important things which, in my judgment, even this House of Assembly ever attempted to handle—fish regulations—and after careful thought decided I would not interfere, in fact decided it was useless. But after a moment's further thought felt that I would be avoiding my duty to my constituents and my country, who had sent me here to represent them, and I immediately decided that I would do my duty. In the Speech from the Throne it has been said that considerable money has been saved by these regulations. I, for one, cannot see it, nor can any other man acquainted with the full facts. It's really a dream, it's not a reality. I would be glad if it were true, but I know it is not. Now, on

or about the 6th day of February I made a speech to the Board of Trade. I tried to be moderate and fair, as I was anxious that any attempt to assist the fishermen in obtaining better prices for their products shoud not be bocked. But, Mr. Speaker, I contended that these regulations, in the way of fixing prices, were dangerous, mischievous and troublesome, and the only way prices would ever be fixed was by supply and demand, and I said at that meeting, using the words of one of England's Prime Ministers, "Just wait and see," and now results are beginning to prove that I was correct. Fish is troublesome produce to handle; it is a perishable article, it is similar to the fruit trade, not quite as perishable, but nearly as bad in a warm climate. It has been said that under my time as Minister of Shipping, I tried to rule the prices, etc. That is not correct. It was an arrangement made by the merchants themselves, in which I acted as chairman, and it only covered a term of a month, to be cancelled at any time if they so decided.

We did not interfere with prices anywhere, except in Brazil, where we tried to maintain prices, but had nothing whatever to do with payment, etc. That was entirely for the merchant himself on the other side. We tried to regulate cargoes for different markets, but this was mostly with Labrador fish—that is practically what I did. Associated with me were Hon. W. B. Grieve, late Hon. J. Harvey and Hon. A. E. Hickman, and as soon as markets brightened we dropped it again. During my visit last May and June I learned certain things in connection with exchange, and I called a meeting of the Board of Trade and told the exporters exchange would likely go very low, and I was prepared to give every assistance I could in helping to arrange for the coming season's catch. The merchants wanted the Government which I was associated with to lay down some rules and regulations re shipments, etc., but they declined to interfere—that, Mr. Speaker, is the history of anything I did with fish.

Some time last December I attended a meeting with several exporters and discussed with Mr. Hawes the handling of our fish in Italy, and what could be done with the Consorzio. We had a considerable number of meetings, and I pointed out to Mr. Hawes all I did through the Governor, the British Government, etc., yet we could do nothing with the Consorzio, and I feared he would have the same result. Yet Mr. Hawes started in to work with the Consorzio, and some time late in October I got a note saying he had made sales and hastened to give me the good news, but alas the sales fell through. On November 3rd, as you gentlemen are fully aware, we were beaten at the polls, and as soon as the result was known, I understand Messrs. Hawes and Job proceeded to Port Union, and, presumably, some arrangement was made with the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, which was never discussed with me; and the next I knew was that regulations were issued from the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, regulations laying down prices, etc., and appointing Mr. Hawes agent.

After reading these regulations carefully, I decided to sell my holdings of fish locally, and did so, as I saw trouble ahead. Now, Mr. Speaker, begins the real trouble. I claim, and nobody to the contrary can prove different, that the fixing of prices, etc. has brought about a change of affairs that really may be very serious, indeed more serious than most people can imagine. Just imagine, if you can, our country with a population

of 250,000, a small sized city, dictating to millions what they must pay for codfish. One would imagine we were the only country in the world who catch fish, but we are facing all kinds of competition now that the world war is over, and if we are not very careful we may lose our markets altogether.

I can well remember our Black Monday in 1894. Be careful, then, gentlemen, that history does not repeat itself. Remember the financial position of the world to-day is unsound, and these countries we sell our fish to are seriously handicapped by this great difference in exchange. Remember that to-day it is not hastily we must act, but with serious and careful judgment. One mistake may ruin the whole trade of the country. Diplomacy is required. Standardize your fish, and give your customer the article you profess to sell. Never mind fixing prices. Supply and demand with quality will remedy that, and let everybody sell to whom he pleases. Apparently someone has found light in his darkness. Take Mr. Walter Monroe's message of warning in a cable sent here the other day:

"My opinion is regulations now detrimental to trade interests. If continued, curtail supplies to a minimum. Give publicity."

What does it mean? Mr. Monroe is on the other side and has seen what has happened, and he is now a big enough man to admit his mistake and I feel before very long, gentlemen, that the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries will do the same. Just wait and see. We do not realize at all what the loss has been to us through these regulations. I will here compare figures as to shipments to Brazil:

Sir John Crosbie presented statistics. Amongst them he showed that from Oct. to Dec. 31, 1918, 69,457 drums were sent to Brazilian consignees. For the same period of 1919, the number of drums was 111,885, showing a shortage of about 43,000 drums.

Shipments during the six months ending on March 31st last, compared with shipments of the corresponding months of 1918-1919, show a decrease of 70,000 drums. Figure up the loss.

70,000 drums would mean a loss on:—

Packages	$105,000
Labor on same	42,000
Less Freight at 2½	175,000
	$322,000

Look at the loss to coopers and to people who have been making drums in Conception Bay, also to laborers, and the loss on freight, etc. Where is this money gone? It is easily answered. I will read to you a clipping from The Maritime Merchant:

"From the importers' standpoint things to-day are looking pretty good, except in the consignment markets. Port Rico and Barbados are overloaded with supplies, but Cuba is a ready purchaser, with prospects that she will continue such for some months to come. North Brazil, too, has begun to buy quite freely, after showing extreme bashfulness for some time, and it is expected that she will be a good customer until after the Lenten season; she is not, however, willing to pay the high prices of last year. One of the most interesting bits of news in the dried fish trade at present is what comes to us from Newfoundland. The Government down there are attempting to regulate the export price of fish; that is, to set a minimum below which nothing can be sold. Permits to make shipments have to be secured from the Gov-

ernment who also stipulate the terms which may be given to foreign purchasers. The effect of this effort will not be felt directly in our market, the West Indies, but it should have a tendency to strengthen prices in a general way, and so it is that we find local exporters much more satisfied with the business outlook than they were a year ago. They think they can now see quite clearly how it will be possible for them to clean up everything they have without much effort; they feel that they should have the minimum of worry from this time forward. Some enquiries locally are reported from Italy, but stocks held here which would suite for that market are unfortunately light; what there is that would suit is needed, so it is said, for 'order' trade with Brazil."

How delighted these Nova Scotians must have been. Halifax got the coopers making packages, Halifax laborers got the labor, and Canadian ships likely get the freights, and poor old Newfoundland must suffer. Isn't it awful. All through an error in judgment, making rules and regulations to suit some people. Brazil regulations call for practically 90 per cent. payment before the cargo sails; in the old way they used to pay on 60 or 90 day bills, which, apparently, most people were satisfied. But, now you cannot do this any more; you must pay cash, and buyers fight shy and do business with other countries on reasonable terms. Yet, they turn around and force us to do business with Mr. Hawes, and draw at 60 or 90 days at Mr. Hawe's pleasure, when often and often we could sell cargoes outright. In other words, they change things at Brazil and turn around and change the conditions and practically go back to Brazil conditions in Europe. It is a funny state of affairs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Spain has gone to pieces, just as I expected, and predicted. Hawes practically throws up the sponge and sends his ultimatum, and I will read you his cable:

"Situation Spain serious. Our total stocks 58,000, besides 25,000 on the way. Spain average total sales 2,000 weekly. Alicante advise has ample proof Lazo offering Alicante really good quality large and medium 71|6, small 68|—. In interests of consignments already received and next season, protest must refuse anything more whatever even without advances."

If what Hawes says is right, there is forty weeks' stock there, and he now refuses anything whatever without advances. Oh, what a change to the wonderful things these regulations were going to do. I wonder what about these hundreds of thousands of dollars they saved. Wait a bit, we are not through with Mr. Hawes. He is a clever man, although he could not handle the Consorzio like he handles the merchants here. He is clever, and somebody may find Mr. Hawes is not through yet. There is going to be lots of trouble before these regulations of the past winter are finished.

What is the position in Oporto today? On April 7th, 1919, the stocks were 5,405 quintals, consumption 7,285 qtls.; April 14th, 1919, the stocks were 15,275 qtls.; consumption, 5,698 qtls.; April 28th, 1919, the stocks were 6,939 qtls. consumption, 4,053 qtls.

Compare the position, same dates, for 1920:

April 3rd the stocks were 68,557 qtls.; consumption, 7,743 qtls. April 8th, the stocks were 75,200 qtls.; con?-sumption, 5,000 qtls.; April 15th, the stocks were 60,000 qtls.; consumption 4,057 qtls.; April 19th the stocks were 55,715 qtls.; consumption 5,200 qtls.

And with six cargoes outside to en-

ter. I will now read a message received from Oporto, which surely speaks for itself:

"Owing regulations, unless shippers avail of their consignees and sell at best prices obtainable, result ruinous. Six cargoes waiting instructions here."

Is this not enough to make one sit and wonder what's to happen next? If something is not done, fishermen who have fish to come in here this spring will realize to their sorrow something has happened, as it will be practically unsaleable. What are we going to do with large and medium that is in the country now if these markets are unable to handle it? It is really serious, more serious than we think.

Last November no shipper was allowed to ship fish unless he could name the price and destination, not even to Halifax, yet when the Hon Minister of Marine and Fisheries returns from his trip his advice is to sell all you can to Halifax, rush all the fish you can there—what a change! Consorzio and Hawes—nobody seems to understand just what happened there. Some say Hawes sold 200,000 quintals and all kinds of great things were done; yet I know when some people get their account sales and final adjustments they won't be very happy. I know of a cargo sold to them which is now returning. I feel confident that things in Italy are much more serious than some people think. Yet, 1920 catch will never realize the prices of 1919, just as sure as the chickens come home to roost, and that's pretty sure. Yes, regulations may be required, standardization of quality is a move in the right direction. Have proper inspection to see the qualities are shipped as sold. This, in my mind, is a move in the right direction, but don't interfere with price. Let a man sell to the best advantage; some men may be satisfied with reasonable profit, while others are not. Why should be not be allowed to sell at a small profit? Again, if these regulations of prices remain, no young man can ever step up the ladder; he is down and out, the big man will be the man. It is difficult to know just what to do, but one must not act too hastily, it requires great thought and consideration. Remember to-day we have all the competition we want coming along from Norway, Iceland, France and England, which will all be competing with us. How can we then fix prices Utterly impossible. Get the quality up to a good standard and supply and demand will cover the rest. Buyers? Yes, the more the merrier; it makes competition in our local markets keener; it helps finance, and it will help the fishermen to obtain the very best prices for their fish.

I appeal to the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to be very, very careful. Fish is our chief product; any false move may possibly change the financial position of Newfoundland in more way than he or I ever dreamt of,—he, who was sent by the fishermen to the House to protect their interests. I again appeal to him, don't act too hastily, get the best brains the country can produce and give everything great and careful consideration, and, after all, good may come out of evil.

Finance,—the world to-day is topsy-turvy. Yes, I believe Newfoundland fishermen and merchants all did well the past five years; but they enlarged their business, increased their trade, and to-day they find themselves with vessels, traps, etc., which they cannot sell, and after all, is this not what has always happened in Newfoundland?

London brokers who have helped so many young men to become exporters to-day are essential to this trade, they are not perfect in every-

thing, but they have been of great assistance, in fact they practically acted as a medium between buyer and seller, made finance easy to handle, and were a great assistance in helping to finance the season's catch, but to-day this way of doing business no longer exists. They refuse to advance or handle our fish under these regulations. The result means that the whole fish trade may go into six or seven merchants' hands and then see what will happen. Competition is the life of trade. Take it away and it means disaster—sure. In closing my remarks on the fish regulations I reserve other information and further remarks until the legislation is brought in.

MR. SINNOTT:—Mr. Speaker, in rising for the first time to address the House, I have great pleasure in congratulating you on your appointment as Speaker for the House.

In considering the Speech from the Throne, it occurred to me there are several important things which have not been considered in the speech 't-self. To my mind, Sir, the most notable and the most culpable omission is that the Government have taken no move to make any reduction in the high cost of living. This is all the more remarkable and all the more deserving of condemnation when we remember that the Hon. Prime Minister in his manifesto, which he submitted to the electors of Newfoundland, dealt at great length with this question. To his utterances on this point, both he and his party pledged themselves. The Prime Minister promised that if he and his party were returned, that they would at once deal with the question. Since then nothing has been done. We all thought, Sir, that the delay was caused by the late opening of the House ,but here we were all disappointed. There has been no mention in the policy of the Government of profiteers or profiteering. There is no doubt that profiteering is now carried on in this country. Nobody will deny this, and surely, Sir, there is no more urgent question than this, and the first and chief consideration of this House should be to secure a remedy for this evil. There is no question which so greatly affects the people of this country, and I regret very much that no consideration has been given it as yet. I would suggest, Sir, through you, that the Prime Minister and his colleagues should remember their pre-election promises in this regard and take immediate steps to deal with this matter.

MR. J. R. BENNETT:—Mr. Speaker, in rising to express my views on the Speech from the Throne, I would first like to take the opportunity of offering my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply. We all listened with pride and gratification to the speeches made by Lieut. Small and Sergt. Major LeGrow, and we all felt gratification that in this the first election after the great war, that representatives of our regiment found a place and seat in this House. It is truly fitting that those who have done so much, those who have fought and died for the country in the country's day of peril, should have some recognition from the people of the country when formulating the governing body of the country. In those two gentlemen we have representatives who will carry out the traditions of the regiment in which they played so prominent and creditable a part. They will continue to fight for the country, not on the battle field, but on the floors of the legislating house of the country, and I feel sure that at all times they wil be ready to stand up, and champion everything that is for the interest of their native land. It is a regrettable feature that we have not a representative or a couple of representatives of the other branch of the service. It would have been

fitting if the men of the Royal Naval Reserve, had some representative on the floors of the Assembly, and in that desire, we on this side of the House can claim that we made an honest attempt to meet the situation, and endeavoured to bring home to the people of one of the most important districts of the Island, the claims of one man who at the time of the war acquitted himself in such a manner that he was entitled to the gratitude of his countrymen. I refer to the gentleman who contested the district of Trinity Bay, Mr. Matthews, Royal Naval Reservist. Mr. Matthews, after his return from his duties in His Majesty's navy, took a very prominent part, and played a very creditable role in the organization of the G.W.V.A. I can look back with pride and gratification to several interviews I had with Mr. Matthews, and his associates in connection with affairs appertaining to the welfare of our soldiers and sailors. I can vouch, and would state here this evening, that no more fitting representative of those men who played such an important part in the war, men who came from all parts of the Island, to participate in the great events of the North Sea, and other parts of the Empire, than Mr. Matthews who was defeated in Trinity Bay. He was the victim of circumstances.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS:—He was on the wrong side.

MR. BENNETT:—If you think so, well very good, but the time may come to prove that he is on the right side.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS:—I mean the antipathy for you and those associated with him.

MR. BENNETT:—The antipathy towards me was not the question. I was not the individual and I was not the cloth that they had antipathy for. Isn't that what you mean.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS:—No.

MR. BENNETT:—The antipathy towards Mr. Matthews was not on account of himself and it is a deplorable condition in this country when men are judged not according to themselves or their work or what they stand for. Circumstances arose in the election last fall that were deplorable and as a free people we ought to be ashamed of the attitude of certain sections of the press as regards the issues before the country during the last election. The issues before the country were lost sight of absolutely and the whole country was swayed on prejudice that was never before equalled.

HON. MINISTER OF SHIPPING:—It came from your side.

MR. BENNETT:—I ask you to keep quiet, and you will have an opportunity later. I was leading up to my argument about Mr. Matthews when I was indecently interrupted by several members of the Government who ought to know better. I evidently trod on somebody's corn because their conscience immediately came to the surface and they had to say something in self-defence.

Mr. Matthew's character was clean, honest and above board, and I say that he deserved better treatment from his countrymen and his townsmen. It's deplorable that we have not a representative in this House from His Majesty's Navy and the Royal Naval Reserve, and, if Mr. Matthews was given his rights he would have been granted a seat and his seat should not have been contested as a compliment to the work done by him during the four years of war.

Passing from that I would like, as one of the senior members of the House, to extend a welcome to those members who sit here for the first time. It is a matter of pride that there are so many young men amongst

us. The day is gone past when a man has to live to get old before given a position of trust and responsibility. This is the young men's age, and it is the young men who fought our battles and gained our victories. The young men to-day are taking their places as leaders in church and state and commerce such as they never did before. I feel sure that we have here from the younger generations representatives who will so enhance the value of the debates of this Assembly that the country will receive a benefit that at the present time we have no means of measuring.

We all listened to an address the other evening from Mr. Fox, member for St. John's East, an address that, judging by the attention given him from both sides of the House, he must have impressed the House to such a degree as would have done credit to mature members thereof.

Mr. Fox's reputation as a public speaker preceded him in this House, but we had no idea before he made that excellent address that we had one amongst us with such qualifications, and, who, without any previous experience in this Chamber, handled the subject in such a polished, clear and fearless manner as the Hon. Member for St. John's East did on that occasion. I am sure every one of us will express the wish that he will have many years of assembling in this Chamber and we hope to see him rise to a position of eminence.

In looking over the Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, one cannot help being struck or cannot help expressing regret, that, after all, there does not appear any of the large and extensive programme of promises during the last election and since. We were hoping to see some large policy outlined, as the Government has been only recently returned from the polls.

The second paragraph refers to the termination of the war. I am sure we all feel with His Excellency and join in the expression of gratification that the great war which has terminated has brought such a victory to the forces of our Empire and our allies; a victory that will go down in history as the greatest achievement that ever the British Empire, in common with her ally France, who bore the brunt and heat and burden of the day, was more responsible in the bringing out of that victory than any other combination of forces. They defeated those who tried to tear down the free institutions of the civilized world.

The Great German Emperor, who in his desire for gain and place and power, has been put in his place where civilization decided he should be put, and it is a matter of thankfulness and gratification to us all that that conflict has terminated in such a manner that has brought honour and glory to our flags and our noble boys. But, Mr. Speaker, the after effects of that conflict are with us now, and we have in common with every other part of the world to face conditions that are extraordinary and unusual; conditions brought about through the strenuous work that had been performed and con ditions that tested the very life blood and the very foundation of our great Empire. And not alone of our Empire but of almost every civilized country in the world. Most of those countries to-day are practically in a state of financial collapse. We have seen in our old beloved Mother country a currency depreciated in the markets of the world, such as has never occurred before. We have had in this country a feeling of unrest, a feeling of dissatisfaction and a feeling that will require a great deal of effort on the part of those whose duty it is to look after the affairs of the people of the country for many days to come.

When the war was over it was expected that extraordinary conditions would have to be faced that would

require extraordinary ability, experience and determination, and require knowledge as to what is best to be done under such circumstances. We had extraordinary conditions to face during the war and extraordinary conditions require extraordinary efforts on the part of the public men of this country, as they require the same on the part of the public men in every other country. It was essential for the successful carrying on of the war to sink all differences, political, religious and otherwise until after the armistice was established so that one solid phalanx was created to face the issues confronting us and in common with every other part of the empire to, enable us to bring this country out triumphant from the great struggle in which we have been engaged.

That can be accomplished in the ordinary course of events. Some saw fit before the work was attempted, some saw well to disassociate themselves with future governments and with future policies. And it is a fact that during the last two or three years that men who have been in public matters and who have directed them and those who were responsible for the bringing together of different elements have every reason to be satisfied with their action taken with regard to every moment and every action has more than justified itself in the way the country's affairs have been handled during these trying times. The problems that are presenting themselves to us in common with every other part of the world require the best that is in us and require a united front and at least it is desirable that we understand each other in the solution of them.

In the United States of America though they have not had any serious financial position to concern them they are practically in a state of revolution, of industrial unrest and general dissatisfaction pervades the whole land and if that can be taken as a sign of the times serious trouble is in store for that country, in spite of their wonderful resources and their splendid financial position.

We have heard a great deal since the House opened with regard to the high cost of living. I am not going to attempt to blame the government for the present high prices that are asked for the necessaries of life. I do not say that the government as a government is responsible to do something that will require from those who are supposed to be profiteering an explanation that will satisfy the people of the country whether undue profiteering is taking place. The man in the street is practically living in a fog with regard to the situation. It might be all right enough in the case of the wholesale grocer, the retail grocer, the dry goods merchant or any other business man dealing with the markets.

The man in the street must be satisfied that the right is being done. Whereas the others have every reason to know whether the proper prices are being charged. But the man in the street, the man with a family of nine or ten children, whose mouths have to be fed, is compelled to go out and demand extra wages for work which were never demanded before and these demands are considered exorbitant and excessive when one considers how much food he can buy for a five dollar bill as compared with the amount bought with a one dallar bill four years ago and when one considers that we have reached a period of unprecedented problems, I think we ought to think the demands of the workman only reasonable.

Everybody knows that the money that he earns by the sweat of his brow is no good to him. He cannot

get decent returns for it. I do not say the government is responsible but it is the government's duty to see and find out and declare to this dissatisfied country to those who have to purchase the necessaries of life whether or not unjust prices are being required and when the government does this they are only doing what is their duty and doing what is right by the people. Of course the war carried with it extraordinary conditions. And now that the war is over we are looking forward to a reduction to a letting up of the conditions that existed all through the war. But instead of there being on improvement in matters these matters are getting worse and worse and we have a spectacle as already pointed out of the labouring man and the mechanic and every other man earns his bread by the sweat of his brow unable to get a decent living no matter what wages he earns because of the existing conditions. I say Mr. Speaker, that the government has a solemn duty to the people of this country.

The people of St. John's have not the advantages of the outport men. The man in the outport has many advantages which the man in St. John's has not. In the outports he has his own home and plot of ground, his sheep or his pig and his cow or goat to help him to make things easy. He catches his food right at his door and grows his own vegetables and raises his own meats, but the poor unfortunate man in St. John's who has to live in the back street and got to pay his hard earned money for everything he requires.

He will be in such a position that I may say he eventually when the last straw is thrown on him he will rise and demand to know whether or not all these things are justifiable and right. I therefore wish, Mr. Speaker, desire to impress upon the Prime Minister and the honourable members of the House the pressing necessity for some effort to be made to give to the people a true statement of affairs and let the people know that when they pay nineteen dollars per ton for coal it is either justifiable or not; whether it is right and proper that the people should be charged twenty dollars per barrel for flour; whether the price of fifty cents for a pound of butter, margarine, is justifiable; whether the necessaries of life have been increased beyond that which the market requires. I say that if this information is given under the due and proper authority it may obviate a serious condition of affairs.

Surely we are interested to the extent to satisfy the people that the situation before us just as we see it, just as it was pointed out by Sir John C. Crosbie, that it is only a matter of supply and demand. I do hope that this will be explained to the people and that the government will make an effort to stop any undue profiteering if any such profiteering exists in the country to-day.

The second part of the second paragraph of the speech from th throne which His Excellency the Governor was made to express referred to the effect of war and suggests that sympathy be extended to the people, (reads para. 2.) The question of good will and peace among the warring nations is one I suppose that is occupying the minds of great men and even the greatest minds in the world to-day.

Peace and good will among the warring nations we'll hope and pray will come and that a permanent peace will ensue and this world will be restored to it's former condition of happiness and prosperity. If everything goes as they are now going I am afraid it will be long before that happy condition of things will be ac-

complished. It will be some time before the period of reconstruction will be successfully passed, some time before we will be back to our former status. Peace and good will as comes from the mouth of His Excellency the Governor on the advice of the Government is an expression of insincerity.

What is the use to shout "peace, peace" when there is no peace? This House cannot be looked upon with confidence at present. The constitution of this House was not sown in peace nor yet in good will. During the last election men were not judged according to their light, not according to their records, not according to their qualifications, not according to their ability to carry on the Government or business of the country. I made a remark this afternoon about a man who had gone to fight for his native country and who had offered himself as a candidate. He was refused. It is a sorry spectacle to see a man so well deserving turned down by the people. Vital issues were lost sight of. The vileness of the political campaign has no parallel in the history of Newfoundland. Things that transpired in the last election will never be blotted out. Each side blames the other for conducting a sectarian campaign. I am here this evening to state my reasons for fighting the campaign under the leadership of Sir Michael Cashin. In 1908, when Sir Edward Morris fought an election campaign he came back with 18 to 18, and subsequently in 1909 when he came back to the country was returned with a substantial majority. In 1913 he was again returned with the Government. In the election of 1909 Mr. Squires, the leader of the present Government, was elected as a member of Sir Edward Morris' Government, In 1913 he went back to his district and was defeated, but with the consent of a number of us who are today on the opposition he was given a seat in legislature and the portfolio of Minister of Justice. During my term I was closely associated with Sir Edward Morris, and I may say that no man ever occupied the Prime Minister's chair who was stronger, more determined, less prejudiced than he was. Never did he descriminate against a man. On the contrary, I to assist and help men whose religious convictions were not his. Right down through that Government the utmost harmony existed under Sir Edward Morris' leadership. After he retired from public life and went to a sphere of greater usefulness for the empire, where he would have a broader field of activity. When the dissolution of the national government took place last spring I was a member of that section of the Government that was called upon to form a new government. For the purpose of forming that Government and being its leader the man with the greatest experience and financial ability was called upon. Every denomination has its proper representation. In the course of events an election was called. I would not have gone to the country under the leadership of Sir Michael Cashin if I did not have faith in him, his integrity and ability, and that he would succeed if elected as Prime Minister. When he went to the country he had to look for candidates for the various districts, some of which he knew would just go by default. Some of the districts the minister of marine and fisheries has in his pocket, but the men were found who were willing to go to these districts. There was no effort made to choke any man out from opposing us. The result of the election was in some respect a surprise.

Mr. Speaker, as the House closed for recess I was drawing your atten-

tion to certain incidents that have happened in the general elections of the past ten or twelve years. I refer to the fact that in 1908 Sir Edward Morris formed a party and went to the country as leader of that party. Associated with him on this occasion were some hon. members who are sitting here tonight on the Government and Opposition sides of the House. Included in these gentlemen was the Hon. Leader of the Government, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition Sir Michael Cashin.

It will be remembered that the result of the election of 1908 was a tie, each party coming back leading the same number of men. A historical deadlock ensued and after some difficulty His Excellency the Governor McGregor, gave Sir Edward Morris a dissolution and he again went to the country for the Government in 1909. The result of the election proved that the country expressed a very strong endorsation of the policy of the Morris Government as shown by the ballots. In 1913 we again went to the country and although my hon. friend maintained his seat in the pre-election this was not so in 1913. He came back a badly defeated candidate and with the consent of the government and the approval of the people he was given a seat in the Legislative Council. Similar treatment was meted out to Mr. S. Blandford, who was given the port folio of Minister of Agriculture and mines and a seat in the Legislative Council.

When Sir Edward Morris again led his party to the country a very strong feeling of antagonism to him prevailed because of the denomination of which he was a member and when his government was installed in office, it was found he had amongst his followers some of the strongest members of other denominations possible to secure in public life And, for my knowledge, and I was in very close contact, and in a position to observe every action of Sir Edward Morris during his administration. I state here without fear of contradiction that on no occasion did he show any prejudice against any member who might be looking to him for favours, or for any of his people. It was always his policy to do what he could and in fact put himself out to give every possible concession to those who were on different persuasion religiously than he was himself.

The fact of a member being a Roman Catholic has no bearing on the religious aspect of a government. It has been stated that there is a Protestant majority in this country. That is quite true. But Sir Edward Morris was senior to all except Sir Robert Bond and it is only fit, and only proper and common justice would expect that he should be selected and that he would make a desirable Prime Minister and one whom the people would like to have represent them.

When the National Government, under the leadership of Dr. Lloyd, was defeated in the House by a vote of confidence, he as the Premier placed his resignation in the hands of the Governor.

When the Governor asked him (Dr. Lloyd) who he would recommend, he told him to send for Sir Michael Cashin, because Sir Michael was the senior member of the Assembly, a man who had twenty-seven years of experience in this House, a man who through all these years represented one district, his native district, and the district his father lived in before him and I don't know but his grandfather also, and in the twenty-seven years he represented the people of that district in the Assembly, naturally he gained a large experience, and

through all the vicissitudes that occurred in that time, Sir M. P. Cashin sailed gallantly on in his career, and maintained and upheld his position and dignity through all these years.

Sir Michael Cashin saw His Excellency the Governor and was asked if he would form a Government. He promised he would endeavour to do so. He came down and he did form a government from the then sitting members of his chamber, a government of men who were not easily to be swayed or influenced or controlled or directed, but a government of strong men. In this I don't want to be egotistical, but the men had large and lengthy experience in public affairs, men that had the experience during the war, when the most extraordinary situations arose and had to be dealt with; men who were successful in private life, and men who understood the responsibilities of legislature.

He formed his government and appointed his Executive Council and departmental heads. It was the intention to hold an election in the spring, but I objected to it and myself and Mr. Higgins were accused of having cold feet over the matter. I say now as I said then I did not think the spring of the year was a proper time to hold an election. It did not matter to St. John's East and West because here the election could be held without difficulty. But some of the northern districts such as St. arbe, Twillingate and Fogo would be ice bound, and it would be impossible for the men to get to the ballot boxes to exercise their franchise.

If that election had taken place in the spring of the year, those men who would have been elected in some distrcts would be elected by a declamation unfair that the people should be disfranchised in that manner. I was acting in the interest of the people in objecting to an election being held in the spring. Some of the honorable members on the other side of the House were in accordance with that project, more of them were in favor of the election and wanted it to take elace. The election was held in the usual month of October, or November. It may be said this fact put us out of office, and put others in, that being so I am quite satisfied to bow to the will of the people I would rather be defeated under such conditions than be elected if the peoplt would have to be disfranchised, and unable to cast their vote.

As I said before Sir Michael Cashin formed his party, and we went to the country as a party, and put candidates in every district. There is no district but there was a candidate for the Liberal Progressive Party, and though we felt in many cases is was a forlorn hope, still we wanted them to say to the country that we wanted a free fight, a free expression of public opinion on the merits of the parties that were then contesting for the votes and favours of the electors. The election should have been a credit to ourselves and to the country because I recognize in many of the honorable members who sit on the other side of the House that they would be incapable of trying to ask improper means to gain the favours of the voters, and I am sure that the majority of them were not favourable to the scurrilous campaign that was carried on in St. John's and I refer to the newspapers in particular.

There is no reason in the world why we cannot disagree or agree to disagree on matters of a public nature. It would be unfortunate if we were all of the one mind politically. We would sink into a state of indifference that would be deplorable. We must have the Government on one side to carry on the affairs of the country and an Opposition on the other side whose duty it is to criti-

cise, and to see that the interests of the people are looked after. Unfortunately for all of us a bitterness arose during that election that has never been equalled in the history of the country. It is ridiculous to say that if you follow Sir Edward Morris who is a Roman Catholic, that you should not follow Sir Michael Cashin because he is a Roman Catholic. I did not follow him because he was a Catholic. I do not recognize denominations when it comes to a point of government. I would be unworthy of the trust that has been reposed in me by the people, if I turned my back on Sir Michael Cashin who in an emergency was asked to come forward and form a government to carry on the affairs of the country. I would be unworthy of myself and the country if I turned my back on a man because he did not belong to the same church as myself. I went to the district with Sir Michael Cashin, because I thought he was the best man in sight to take the position of Prime Minister.

Unfortunately for the country, for the people of the country and for this House that issues arose in connection with the election that had nothing whatever to do with the vital question or the future prosperiy of the land.

A man was not judged according to what his duties were or according to his record, or according to the amount of work he had put in in the country, but rather was an estimate made of him, based on the opinions and writings of those who saw fit in their effort to gain power and place and pay, by a campaign of villification, lying representation and personal abuse. The vital question before the country was hidden altogether. I claim that this last election was not fought on any policy. It was not fought on the issues that were at stake. It was not fought as reasonable and proper as British subjects should fight it, but it was fought with a serpent that ran throughout the whole land. The dragon raised his head amongst us, and was so well referred to by my friend the hon. member for St. John's East the other evening. A man was not judged according to his ability, but he was judged by the altar that he worshipped at. I say that it was a most deplorable, a most unworthy and a most unreasonable attitude for any person or persons, individual or combination to take.

I referred this afternoon to the fact that two soldiers representatives are in this House, and we gladly welcome them. We are all proud to know that the regiment has representation in this Assembly, but deplore the fact that the senior branch of the service, the Royal Naval Reserve, is not represented here; and deplore the fact that a representative of that gallant body of men went down to Trinity, his own native district; who for four long years had fought their battles and ours, who had no stain upon his character, and hardly saves his nomination fee because he had been on one side or the other, a graceful act indeed, and one worthy of any leader of any party. I think it would have been more in keeping with dignity if a vacant seat had been left for Mr. Matthews and that he had come in here unopposed, as a mark of apprecition for the services he had rendered his King and country.

It is deplorable that this House is not more united, and that it is divided on lines that may lead to terrible consequences. Problems have to be solved in this country, caused by war conditions, and which are occupying the attention of the best minds of the whole world. The responsibilities of office that the gentlemen on the other side have taken up were never greater and never called for more ability and honest endeavor than they will be called upon to perform during the

next two or three years, and it is unfortunate that this House should be divided amongst itself, so to speak. And if we see no indication that this sort of thing is not going to let up, it is going to put man against man and creed against creed. We see daily exhibitions in the press of vile attempts of the abuse that was used during the elections and since.

Every member on this side of the House is abused and his actions and words misrepresented. If because the Hon. Mr. Fox got up the other night and in that straight-forward and honest attempt denied the efforts that had been made and were still being made to introduce in this Legislature a feeling of distrust and separation, that he is subjected to abuse and villification, then I say God help this country. It is quite true that this Legislature, and very rightly so, is generally made up on denominational lines. Ever since I have been in this House the three leading denominations namely, Roman Catholic, Church of England and Methodist have had practically equal representation on these floors, and generally these denominations were intermingled. there was never an sect or body on one side or the other. Unfortunately this does not exist to-day. If this House and the Government of the country is to be represented denominationally, if that is the practice there must be some basis to go on. The Executive Council is composed of nine members, three of each denomination. This House is composed of thirty-six members, usually twelve of each denomination. We were all satisfied with the representation in the years past. What was good enough for our fathers before us in this respect ought to be good enough for us to-day. But I want to point out that what exists in this chamber should also exist in the other chambers as well. The upper house of this Legislature is also laid down on denomination representation. There are twenty-four members when that house is full, eight of each denomination. Precisely the same position and the same principle as is laid down here and in the executive Government is laid down in the Legislative Council.

But the Prime Minister and his associates in the Government have seen fit to disorganize that principle in the upper chamber. They have seen fit to upset the denominational representation there. We had three vacancies up there caused by the deaths of Honourables Dr. Skeleton, John Harvey and A. F. Goodridge. There was three Church of England seats left vacant in that chamber. Two other seats were vacated by my hon. and learned friend, the Prime Minister, and Hon. Jesse Whiteway. The three Church of England seats were taken from that chamber and two of them given to Roman Catholics.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER,—That is not so. The Hon. Mr. Harvey's seat was given to Hon. Mr. Shea, my own seat to the Hon. Dr. Campbell and one of my own denomination went to a Church of England gentleman.

MR. BENNETT—Why were two of the Church of England seats given to two Roman Catholics?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—To show you that I am not guilty of bigoted sectarianism that you have been throwing across the floors.

MR. BENNETT—I am a member of the Church of England denomination and I protest against it. You are not the whole Protestant denomination if you think you are.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—For the information of the hon. member, I may say that I submitted the pro-

position to the Lord Bishop of Newfoundland before doing so.

MR. BENNETT:—That does not matter who you submitted it to. You usurped the rights of one denomination and gave it to another. Political expediency was the reason. You had to find a seat for Dr. Campbell otherwise he would have to vacate the Agriculture and Mines Department.

I have no objection to that, but he should have found a seat for his friend in a proper way and along the lines of denomination representation. I am surprised that the Church of England representatives in the Executive Council were a party to it. The Church of England throughout the whole island will resent it. I am no sectarian firebug. No one can tell me that whether he is Greek, Jew or Gentile. But I want to see the right thing done, want every interest safeguarded and no interest sacrificed. Everything has been done for political expediency. And I hope the next appointment made up there an effort will be made to remedy the state of affairs you have brought about. We are not here as champions of Protestants and with regard to this I take second place to no one. Yes, on that score I am second to none. even the honourable leader of the government. I never used my religion for political expedience or for any other purpose. But I am true to it and will stand for it every time, no matter what comes or goes. I have a broad mind and see the good points in any man no matter what church he belongs to and I can also see the good points in my enemies. I trust and expect the same consideration from those on the other side of the house.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have already referred to the second paragraph of the speech from the throne and now I am lead to the third paragraph, which gives us the astounding intelligence that His Majesty's Government has devoted two ships to our government. When I was in the Colonial Secretary's Department they offered us one hundred airplanes. They wanted to send out one airplane to Newfoundland. And with clear knowledge of our requirements would not send us that offer. It does not follow that the mention of the British Government or British Admiralty mentions that a lot of people living on pinacles can do no wrong. There are as many blunderers in the British Government and in the British Admiralty as there are on the opposition side or the government side of the house even granting that we are incapable of being a Government. We are not any Simon Pures and that we will admit. We are human beings and have no supernatural power, but we claim to be natural men who carry our sins on our foreheads so that the world may see them.

But when the British Government or the British Admiralty offered us one hundred airplanes we flatly turned down their offer, telling them we had no earthly need for them. But they ought to have the common sense to know that we would appreciate the gift of a seafaring tug capable of going to sea and going to wrecks and such a gift would be to the utmost value to us and I suppose they were so busy over there they forgot to use their judgment until the honourable leader of the Fishermen's Union woke them up and asked them what they were going to do about it, and the answer was they will give us two vessels, and the probability is that neither of them will be of any use to us. We have purchased one for fifteen thousand pounds as informed by the Prime Minister. Maybe the costly one will be useless to us and

then what will be the advantage of one got for nothing. Wait and see until the ships arrive. I hope the Government get their expectations fulfilled. The next part of the speech is that which comes forth from the lips of every Governor for the last twenty years and this is in reference to this question, I mean the Quebec-Labrador Boundary question. His Excellency informs us that an agreement has been arrived at for submission and adjudication to His Majesty's Government. Unless I am mistaken that agreement had been arrived at one or two years before the war. The late Mr. Furlong had the case and I think the Quebec government had arrived at the terms of submission or that case before the Privy Council. But I trust that the announcement is correct and I have every confidence in the Minister of Justice in this particular department and the men associated with him will be capable of looking after the case in the best interest of the colony. There is very much importance and much value in the settlement of this question. The world is starving for pulp and paper and those who have knowledge of the move of the Canadian and American markets will appreciate this fact that these prices in the pulp stocks and paper stocks are going up in leaps and bounds selling at four hundred per cent. premium. This shows the great value involved in the settlement of this dispute.

The Quebec legislature with the whole Dominion behind it will fight hard to acquire these areas. They will leave no stone unturned to pin us down to the post and I am sure my honourable frined sees that the winning of this case is more important and has more far reaching effect on the industrial life of this Colony than can be imagined. Only last year for the first time in the history of such an undertaking there was survey of the Labrador areas by two aeroplanes. Everyone knows it is impossible to survey these areas without such a facility in less than twenty years. And from reports from those who are in a position to know the wealth of the pulp areas on Labrador is beyond conceptiоn. It is true our our fishery rights are undisputed and we are looking to the near future for a satisfactory settlement of this all important question of the Labrador boundary. It is no use pretending our rights are secure. There is no end to the revenue that can be derived from this source. It would be an unlimited benefit to the country. If no exportation can be brought to Newfoundland, but if it is the intention of the Government to allow it to be exported then a heavy export duty can be imposed and it would mean millions of dollars to the country. I hope the matter will be taken up by the Hon. member for Fortune Bay, Mr. Warren, and if he has to go to the other side he will go there armed with every document necessary and with every particle of evidence necessary to gain our case. If he does win our case he will have done enough for his country, if he does nothing else.

Sir John Crosbie this afternoon gave us an idea of the fish situation. and I am sorry there were not more here to hear him. This is a subject with which Sir John Crosbie is thoroughly conversant. and upon which every member of the House this afternoon must have received some wonderful information. Sir John Crosbie is probably the best authority in the country on this subject. I was struck with the large amount of money lost, the labor and means of livelihood lost to the people of this city and other parts of the country.

He informed us that $105,000 had been lost to the coopers alone. The snatching away of this large sum of money from the mechanics of the city is a most deplorable piece of work. There is no more deserving class of people in this town than the coopers. Unfortunately their income has been reduced by this very large sum by the unpardonable blunder which marked the first step of the government. One hundred and forty thousand dollars lost to the laborers of this town by the enforcement of the fish regulations. Sir John Crosbie is to be congratulated on the masterly way in which he handled this big subject and we are indebted to him for the vast amount of information which he gave us. I believe that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was sincere in making the fish regulations, but surely he must by this time have realised his blunder. It is a serious situation when we have 80,000 quintals of fish on the other side not disposed of, and which there is no market for. Gentlemen, what is going to happen. What will be done with next season's catch? Is this not a most serious outlook for our fish industry. A fish merchant told me a few days ago that he feared that fish would be so low that it would not be worth handling. The fishermen won't be able to pay for the bread box. I hope that the Minister of Marine and fisheries will see the seriousness of the situation, and will do his best to avert a total collapse. If the fish situation becomes any worse than it is Newfoundland will be down and out and those who are responsible will have to take the blame.

There is another question, namely the question of the survey of foreign-going ships. We heard the other evening reference made to the deplorable disaster in the loss of the s.s. Beverley. I am not in a position to state who is responsible for this disaster. Mr. Fox stated that the case of Mr. Munn, the owner of the cargo, and that he was sorry as to what had happened to it. I do not believe that Mr. Munn would any more send that ship to sea with a cargo of fish knowing that she was unseaworthy than he would drown his own son. That old tub was brought down here from Canada, was altered and presented as seaworthy. I know nothing of ships, but I saw that ship in Placentia, and I would no more go on board here than I would attempt to cross the Atlantic in an open dory. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is to be congratulated on taking this matter in hands. Sir John Crosbie stated that 100 ships that left our shores last year had gone to the bottom. Were our ships subject to worse storms than other ships or were they able to stand the strain required of them? How many of the fleet now in the harbor might have the same fate. Are we to sit idly by and see our able young men lost in that way? I hope that when that Bill is introduced that it will cover the situation and prevent further disasters that may be due to the unseaworthiness of the ships engaged in the foreign trade.

The speech says that an effort is being made to wind up the Department of Militia. That would seem to be the ordinary course of events.

I also notice, Mr. Speaker, that the winding up of the Militia Department is in contemplation. I myself have not seen the necessity of having this Department running for some time, for when the London office was closed the work of the Militia Department here was practically concluded and there is no necessity to continue it further. I was going to ask the Colonial Secretary if anything had been done for the dependents of those brave lads who laid down their lives in the war. I do not mean those dependents who came under the provisions of the Pen-

sions Act originally, but those who were not altogether dependent on those of their sons who went to the front, but who since have not been able to maintain themselves as they did before such as laborers who have grown old. They have made application time and again for badly needed assistance. I am sure that the Leader of the Government will appreciate that when these boys went overseas in 1914 they may have left brothers at home who since they have ceased to be a support to the parents or other assistance which the dependents might have had has since been lost to them. They did not come under the pensions because they had help when their boys went away, but afterwards the Pensions Board was instructed by the Government of the day to take the case of people of this class into consideration and do their best for them. I knew of many cases where men lost their health and were not in position to help themselves. They looked forward to the return of their sons, but they never came.

The cost of the maintenance of the Militia Department, as the Speech from the Throne points out, has run into a very large amount. Our war expenses, at a conservative estimate. amounted to about $15,000,000 which will have to be consolidated with our national debt. Then there will be another $750,000 of $800,000 for pensions which mean a capitalisation of 15 to 16 millions more which, with other war expenditures, will be a total cost to the Colony of 31 to 32 million dollars. This is a very large debt and a large price for our part in the war, and it is a debt to the Colony for all time.

It was hoped, and perhaps it is still hoped, that in the adjustment of Germany's war indemnity that this Colony would receive recognition for her claims on account of the war and I trust that when our claims are put forward that the Minister of Finance will bring to the notice of the authorities on the other side the heavy cost our part in the war has been to the Colony.

I wish to offer my congratulations to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on the acquirement of that sacred ground, Beaumont Hamel. I think, Sir, that this was a graceful act on the part of the Government to hold sacred the spot where so many of our brave lads offered up their lives. No better man could be in charge of the work of looking after the resting place of those boys than Rev. Major Nangle, and I am sure that with him it is a labor or love. I noticed that when Mr. Coaker published his notes some time ago he made reference to the matter of a memorial and how it was treated, and he said he would have an investigation made into the matter. I can say with truth that nothing like this happened while I was in the Militia Department and I trust that when he finishes his investigation he will let us know to whom he referred.

I congratulate the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on the steps he is about to take towards the reorganisation of his Department and the establishment of an information bureau and a research department. I am not in a position to know just what can be done in this direction, but I know that our ignorance on matters pertaining to our fisheries is deplorable and that some effort should be made to familiarise ourselves with the details of our principal industry. I don't know of any man who could tell you what are the habits of the seal, or where our herring go when they leave this coast. Again, Sir, there are many kinds of fish to be found around our coast that the people use as manure and which are in reality a most delicate food article and what can be done with these

auxiliary fisheries, if I may use the word, is, I trust, under consideration by the Minister.

Most people in this country, Mr. Speaker, have grave concern as to our transport problem, foreign, inland and coastal and indeed business people might well be concerned. The railway as has been pointed out, time and again, is in a deplorable condition and what is to be done with it? I presume the Government has under consideration for one of our greatest problems is the railway question. The Reids are under certain contracts to the country and whether or not they have carried out these contracts is a matter for investigation. The coastal traffic has outgrown the capacity of the boats engaged on the work, and an effort should be made to improve the service. I presume that one of the ships coming here shortly from the old country will help out in this respect, and while on that subject I would also express the hope that the government will endeavour to secure suitable premises for the handling of freight as there is at present very unsuitable and inadequate means for this purpose.

I looked with a great deal of interest at the speech from the throne for some reference to workingmen's homes in St. John's and as to what is intended in this connection. It merely states that a corporation has been started having as its object the erection of some houses for the workingmen. This is not news. It is estimated that the cost of each will not exceed $2,000 and that 30 houses will be built this year. Well, of course the statement itself is very vague and the whole paragraph savors of smallness and lack of appreciation of the situation. Thirty houses is only a drop in the bucket. Is the Government going to contribute $60,000 or guarantee a loan, or admit material for building free of duty, or what is the policy? Of course when the application which is foreshadowed comes before the house we will be in a better position to discuss the question.

Let me point out, Mr. Speaker, that this Legislature is the only body which can solve this problem. People won't subscribe a lot of money unless good returns are guaranteed. They may give two or three thousand dollars, but not twenty thousand unless reasonable returns are guaranteed. Sixty thousand dollars is not sufficient to handle this question. It will probably require six hundred thousand. As it is mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, it is only fooling people. What about the 300 families who require homes? Are they to live on in the same condition? Isn't it the duty of this Legislature to come to their assistance, leaky and inadequate homes . . . . the people cry out daily, and this is the answer . . . . we are going to build thirty houses. It is only a mockery. When this country requires coastal service or lighthouses this Legislature finds a remedy for both, and rightly so. When such matters come up for discussion, I say that I have no direct interest in this matter, but I give it my support to preserve and protect and facilitate the interest of our fishermen. But, the fisherman has his cow, his sheep, his farm. He can grow his vegetables and live happy and contented, but as a general rule the same cannot be said of the working man of St. John's. The outport man has his home but the city man, in many cases cannot pay the rental, much less build a house for himself. A great many outport people come to St. John's and build a house because they have a chance to save the money.

It is only a short time ago that the working man in the city was receiving sixty cents to one dollar per day. What chance had he to pay any

money out of such a paltry salary? Although wages have increased two and three hundred per cent. he is no better off. Something should be done for these people and I think the Government will show their British fair play in dealing with the subject. We build hospitals, asylums and sanitariums and take in the sick and cure them of their diseases, but we neglect the cause that leads up to the condition which makes is necessary to build these institutions and allow people to live in houses that are not fit for human habitation. I hope the members of the Government and other men associated and concerned in this matter will formulate a scheme to alleviate this condition of affairs.

I know that my friend Mr. Anderson would like to see 100 houses started this year if he had the means, but he cannot get it without the aid of Legislature. If Legislature will advance, say one quarter of a million at 5% to enable him to put up these homes, I do not think it would be unreasonable, and charge the people a fair rent according to the houses they occupy, and if the Legislature is called upon to contribute each year five, ten, fifteen or twenty thousand dollars, it will be money well spent. I think, Mr. Speaner, my honorable friends of the Government side, and my honorable colleagues, will welcome any such proposition, and honourable leader of the F.P.U. is too generous a man to block any such movement, and I am sure everybody will see that it is only fair to the town, because it is the capital of the country, and as such it is entitled to every consideration. I hope this matter will receive the most earnest consideration of the government, when it is brought before the house.

The question of prohibition has been discussed a lot in this house, and from the tenor of remarks of those who have spoken, the house and the country are united in the opinion, that something must be done to relieve the present intolerant situation. The carrying out of the prohibition act has become a delusion and a snare. this question is occupying the minds of every nation in the world. The United States has gone absolutely dry, but like ourselves they have experienced some disconcerting incidents in connection with the carrying out of the Act, and the use of substitutes for the ordinary alcoholic beverages has brought a condition of things, that is more degrading than has ever existed before.

My colleague Mr. Sullivan has made a special hobby of this question, but I fear what he said in his remarks the other day will not come to pass. Instead of saying a bottle a week he said a bottle a day. There is no member of this House wants to see the bar rooms back again, but I think a system should be installed that will be more protective to our certain amount of alcoholic beverages for his own use, so as to prevent the drinking of dope and other alcoholic substitutes for liquor, which is endangering the lives of the people. I say it is up to us to bring in an act that will be more protective to ourselves and will have the interests of the people at heart.

The situation is becoming more difficult in New York, where the consumption of wood alcohol reached alarming proportions, about the end of the year, and the story I heard in this connection may not be out of place here. When New Year's Eve was being celebrated in the city of New York, the police and magistrates noticed that a lot of wood alcohol was consumed, and accordingly they were down to the magistrate's court early next day, but to their great surprise very few cases were brought in, and one magistrate said to the policeman, "How is it that there are so few cases

this morning, after the proceedings of last night?" "Oh," the policeman said, "there is a change come over us here, we don't bring them to the court now, we bring them to the morgue."

The question now is with us the morgue or the penitentiary. I must ask your pardon for delaying the House so long on this matter, but the many questions that arise out of the Speech from the Throne, require from the members on this side of the House the fullest expression of opinion and our desire is to ventilate our opinions on all matters that come before you and the House. I cannot congratulate the Government on the speech, which I consider bald and devoid of many matters requiring fuller attention, but taking everything into consideration it is quite as good as one would expect from the source from which it emanated.

MR. HIGGINS:—It is not my intention to delay the House, but I do feel as has been suggested by the hon. member who just sat down, that the Speech from the Throne is not what we had reason to expect it would be. Before I speak of this, however, might I assure the honourable and ballant gentlemen, Lieut. Small and Sergt.-Major LeGrow that they are welcome to this House, if for no other reason than that they are the first to take seats in this House in uniform, because they are two of the boys who made such a name for themselves in the recent war, and because they have justified their right to be here by the able way in which they conducted themselves on opening day, and may I also say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I think you yourself have particular reason to be proud of the position you occupy to-day in this House, in that you are not only the first fisherman who ever occupied the chair, but also the first Speaker, I believe, to preside over an assembly containing members in His Majesty's uniform. This is a session, no matter what transpires, which will go down in the history of the country, as remarkable in these two points. Now I wish to assure the House that any remarks I make will be made in the spirit I think the Address in Reply merits.

The Address in Reply so far has been remarkable as to its debate in one outstanding feature, and that is, that I think rarely has there been a great number of speakers desiring to deal with matters in a broad way, and I do feel I represent the general sentiment, when I say that we are all proud of some of the speeches made here. I am proud to feel that Mr. Fox is my colleague, and I say that in his speech the other night he did credit to himself and to the House, and Mr. Bennett was also in line with the effort made by Mr. Fox, and I feel we are indebted to Sir John Crosbie for his fine contribution to the debate.

Whatever our opinions may be as to the wisdom or otherwise of the fish regulations, I think we can, as members of this House, feel that he has at least thrown in the discussion that which reflects both on his experience and his intelligence.

Having cleared away some of the brushwood, as it were, I should like to say that my conception of the debate on the Address in Reply is that it should partake of two divisions. The speech from the throne is the occasion upon which the government of the day proclaims, through the medium of the king's representative, its policy for the session upon which we are about to embark, and so in the case of the opening of a new parliament it might properly be termed an "after-election manifesto." Consequently it is proper and right for members of the opposition side to criticize and pronounce fairly upon it, and in review ing it they should draw attention to what the speech foreshadows. Then having done that

they should discuss, as representatives, what they expected the speech to contain and what was expected of the government of the day. Accordingly, anything I have got to say, I assure you, Mr. Speaker, will not be said in any other spirit. The speech, in my humble judgement, has fallen short of what I expected to find there. It is a most remarkable, a most wonderful address, and the hon. gentlemen opposite need have no fear of our remarks on criticizing it. There is an absolute absence of any fault to find, and so there is an absolute lack of any suggestion on our part that we have anything in the way of complaint about anything that is in the address, for the simple reason that there is so very little in it. In other words, it would be like "flogging a dead horse," to go to work and say anything bad about it. The only thing I fear, Mr. Speaker, is that the people throughout the country who only a few short month ago rallied to the support of our new government, will get a rude awakening on reading the speech.

They were told by this great Liberal Reform Party that things were going to be revolutionized. But how quickly our honourable friends opposite have fallen in the same old rut, quicker than anything that happened yet. Perhaps, after all, it is to the credit of the prime minister and his associates that they have not attempted to put anything extraordinary in the speech from the throne. They still leave us hope for the future. Perhaps it is a new precedent and something in line with the policy that the government went to the country on. We are told that wonderful changes were going to take place, changes that would go down in history. Perhaps they thought it was the right course to take, that, having obtained power, they would see what they could do for the people at the next session. I have no fault to find with that attitude, but am candid enough to say that I support it, because it shows the honesty of purpose of the Government if they did promise any outlandish things before the election that they now come in at the earliest opportunity and admit they were not serious.

Now just a word or two as to what is in the Speech anyhow. If I recollect aright attention was drawn to the matter to which I am going to refer by my colleague, Mr. Fox, though rather in a different vein. The second pagaraph concludes:

"I cannot avoid impressing upon you the lesson of all history that a great convulsion is followed by much unrest and that all our patience and sympathy will be required before we can realize under the guidance of Divine Providence a permanent peace upon earth and goodwill amongst formerly warring nations."

Mr. Speaker, that is the sentiment that truly expresses the condition of the country to-day, and I accept it as the basis of the reason why the Government ought be careful and ought attempt to do something in the direction I propose to indicate later on. That has been the history of the world after all previous wars of any kind, unrest. And if that be the condition after wars in the past, how much more unrest must follow the great world war. Unrest means dissatisfaction, and the people are dissatisfied with the conditions about them. Right here in the city of St. John's today we are feeling the after-war effects. I venture to assert to-night that never in the history of the town, at least not in my recollection, despite the apparent prosperity about us, were our people sailing closer to the wind than as at the present time. With the exception of a limited few, the ordinary man such as the clerk, mechanic and laborer was never as hard

pushed as he is today, owing to the high cost of living. In that respect I do not blame the government, nor do I charge the government with it. I say while that condition of affairs is about us we must forget this little pettiness and those cheap things and take criticism in the right spirit. In all sincerity the second paragraph in the speech from the throne befor us fittingly describes the situation. Whatever may be the outcome of our deliberations we are living in abnormal times and there is a state of unrest existing, and after all, let us not forget that we are here with responsibilities.

However much we may disagree with each other on either side, we should not tolerate the abuse and scurrility of the newspaper thugs whose foul minds seek for every opportunity afforded by the liberty of the press to stir up discord.

Regarding the steamers mentioned in the speech, I understand that the gift of the steamers is not altogether the result of this Government's work but the outcome of a promise to the late administration, which was brought to completion by the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. So far as I am concerned I only trust the ships will prove satisfactory for our trade. I do not profess to know much about steamers and I would not match my opinion against that of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or that of Sir John C. Crosbie, but I do know this, that it has been the history of those who have taken steamers from the British government that they have not always proved suitable for commercial purposes. In Dover they even went so far as to refuse some vessels which it was found unsuitable even to fill with concrete and sink as breakwaters, they being too narrow. I trust that we shall not be disappointed and that whatever ships we get through the courtesy of the Admiralty will coincide with the expectations of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. But it must be borne in mind that ships built for war purposes, built to be gun-equipped may not prove so profitable in trade as ships ordinarily used in commerce. But I do hope and trust that the ships are the best, and that we shall not be disappointed. I say this in consideration of those who are responsible for their being brought out here. The Government have made a statement to the effect that they have purchased one ship which costs seventy-five thousand dollars. Well, for the sake of the seventy-five thousand dollars, which the country will be called upon to pay, I hope and trust the ship will be of some use to the Dominion, and that she will not prove too expensive as regards her coal consumption. I repeat that the matter of the acceptance of the Admiralty ships, although we naturally are sensible of the British Government's kindness, is one which we ought not to boost or comment too favorably upon until we have them on this side of the water and tried them in our service. It is unnecessary to delay the hon. gentlemen of the House on a further elaboration of the Quebec boundary dispute. I hope that this shall be settled with every satisfaction to Newfoundland. But I do not set too much confidence in matters that go before the Privy Council being disposed of in a hurry. They are busy people and have a lot of matters to occupy their attention. I am satisfied that the Minister of Justice and those associated with him will do their best for a solution that will be beneficial to this Dominion. I am satisfied that he will, as leader of the bar by reason of his position, give the matter his most serious attention, that he will honestly endeavour and see to it that Newfoundland's inerests get their best possible maintenance. I know the honorable gentleman well enough to say that we shall get from

him his most careful and honest assistance in the matter. It would not be right to make too much comment on the question. It is in the hands of his Department, and I think we can rest assured that it will be looked after in a proper way.

Regarding the Fish Regulations, the first thing the Government did when it came into office was to creat these regulations, which have been the subject of much comment in the local press. They have been discussed on the political platform in St. John's West and have been the subject of comment abroad. Those who oppose and cry down the fish regulations simply from some biased motive, should not be endorsed, as they concern the very industry on which our very existence depends. If the fish regulations are profitable to the country, then we should all undoubtedly support them. I say that with all seriousness. I do not profess to speak with much authority, and so my opinion is rather by way of an abstract principle. I object to them mainly on the ground that the country's destinies should not be placed in the hands of one man, that we should not take the chance, the long chance of confiding the country's future welfare in the brains of one. It is too big a risk to take even if the man be Mr. George Hawes. Since the regulations have started the price of fish has gone down lower than it had been. On the face of it this argues with me somewhat against the regulations. I also object to the regulations because the small man, the man other than the merchant is hit. He is handicapped, he has not the same freedom to sell his fish as he did before the creation of the regulations, and on principle again where the small man is hit I oppose them. May be you say I am following the doctrine laid down by others, that I am imbibing too much from Sir Michael Cashin or Sir John Crosbie. No, freedom of trade generally works out best when one remembers the unalterable law of supply and demand. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries may say, "Boys, hold your fish till the prices are higher." But time passes and if I do not eat a fish on Friday I will not on that account only eat two fish on the following Friday.

We have to try to place our fish in a market where it is wanted. We had a situation not long ago where the people could not pay for our fish. We have the reverse situation to-day. What the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has done is against his own interests. In Nova Scotia they applaud our regulations. They applaud them because they have benefited by them. If they are pleased with what Newfoundland has done, and in this particular they are in competition with us, then it would seem that we have done something that is not good for ourselves. We all feel that the Hon. Ministetr of Marine and Fisheries is competent enough to handle his own business. But if reputable and reliable men have come forward and say that they decline to do business under the fish regulations, then there is something wrong. The fact that we have started on this bad piece of business is no reason why we should continue, and we hope that the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries will not feel that he must carry on, but, on the contrary, will be big enough to say: "We have tried it, and made a mess of it, and will discontinue the regulations." I sincerely hope that he is big enough to handle George Hawes. I will back him to the last ditch. But I would like to say to the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries that I am satisfied that his own connection with the fishermen of the country is large enough to make him do what is right. I feel sure that he will knuckle down to it after a while, though he will find it hard at first.

Reference is made in the Speech from the Throne to the securing of Beaumont Hamel as an assembling place of those who died on July 1, 1916. To some of us this reference comes with especial interest. I speak for those who cannot speak for themselves. However much we may differ from each other on other parts of the speech, I feel I voice the thoughts that would be expressed by those whose mortal remains will be gathered together there when I say that they are grateful to feel that their memory is being cherished. There are here to talk for them two of their own. We meet and commune with the dear departed ones to-night. It is a sacred part of the Governor's speech which makes reference to them. I compliment the Government, and especially the member who is responsible for the securing the field of Beaumont Hamel, for this very important and thoughtful action. The field will ever be held sacred to all Newfoundland. Over there there was no distinction. They were all padres, and the nearest padre whispered the last words of consolation to the departing soul, irrespective of the altar at which they worshipped, and I am confident that those who have learned the lesson will do the necessary missionary work and instill in us that spirit of "over there." We are too close to it yet to begin to get the fine results which must follow the noble sacrifices that were made.

The Speech from the Throne always has a financial paragraph. The present Government is satisfied to take to itself the credit for the happy financial condition. I join with those who have said that the credit belongs to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. But listen to the paragraph:

"The estimates have been subject to considerable revision, and have been based upon the report of the civil service commission appointed by my late ministers. My ministers propose to submit to you for your careful consideration a bona fide statement of the moneys which are estimated to be necessary to cover the expense of the public service of the Colony for the coming fiscal year. They are of the opinion that the practice which has grown up during recent years of submitting estimates far below the actual anticipated expenditure, trusting to provision being made under the head of "Supplemental Supply" at a subsequent session of the Legislature for the authorization of over expenditure, should be discontinued as far as practicable."

Now what a delightful ending,—"as far as practicable."

The practice will go on, Mr. Speaker, we may rest assured of that. Charity, we are told, is the greatest of virtues, and it is more prominent in the Newfoundlande than in anyone else, but surely our charity was never appealed to more strongly than it is here. Of course the gentlemen on the other side of the House are too intelligent to imagine for a moment that anyone will be fooled by that paragraph, and we can sympathize with their attempt to make this paragraph read as if it meant something. The Government has made so many rosy promises that something had to be said that would at least look as if these promised reforms were indeed to be carried out, and we can only compliment them on the beautiful camouflage employed by them.

One point strikes me when hearing the next paragraph read. That is the paragraph with reference to the Department of Marine and Fisheries which speaks of a re-organization and the establishment of an information bureau and scientific research department.

However much the Department of Education may be shrouded in mystery I am confident that if given a chance the Minister of that Depart-

ment has the wilingness and capability to perform good work, and I invite his attention to a matter which is now receiving much attention in Canada, that of fishery colleges. Might I say, Sir, that this is a matter we could also consider with a great deal of advantage. It may not be practical, but ours is a fishing country first of all, and it is due to the importance of the industry that some thought should be given to proper training. In Nova Scotia they are taking the matter up with a great deal of enthusiasm as the results from this training in the western provinces have made it well worthy of consideration.

With regard to the new department, the only thing we can hope for is that some steps of the kind I have mentioned will be attempted. And now, Sir, just another word before I come to the main part of my speech which I have not touched yet. In connection with the introduction of a survey of shipping, might I invite the attention of the Minister of Shipping to the matter of the tickle between Bell Island and the main land. There is ever present there a fear that a great tragedy will occur from the overcrowding of motor boats plying on this tickle, and I think the circumstances in this instance are not unknown to the honorable members of Harbor Grace and other nearby districts. No limit is observed in the carrying of passengers on these boats, they are crowded on board indiscriminately and without any regard for the safety of life, and I do think, Sir, that this is a matter which should receive the earliest attention.

As to the creation of a Department of Posts and Telegraphs I say that in the late Postmaster General we have lost a man that was capable, competent and highly trustworthy as an official and as a citizen cultured and creditable to the community. But I do say that in the man who has gone into this department we have one who as those who have met him in a previous official capacity will testify is courteous and kindly and ever ready to respond to any reasonable request made upon him, thorough and highly competent. I was going to congratulate Dr. Barnes, but there is so much mystery still clinging about his department that it is too soon for that. As to the work which it is said he will have to do I think that he is too good a man to be contented with work which Mr. Butt of the Colonial Secretary's Department does now—issuing cheques. We are honestly afraid that for a man of his capabilities he will not be given enough to do and in the meantime I might say to Dr. Barnes that if his department is as harmless as the facts at present appear to indicate, he may stay there as long as he likes so far as anybody on this side of the House is concerned.

The reorganization of the Department of Mines is a step which I think has long been necessary, and the pity is that the new Minister is not in this House. However, I feel sure that Dr. Campbell will give this work his best attention and if he is not a member of this House that is more his misfortune than his fault. Time there was when the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries stood on this side of the House hammering the desk and denouncing in a voice much louder than mine and with eloquence more stirring than mine the fates which permitted a defeated candidate to occupy the office of Minister of this Department, but now the positions are reversed. Like myself he brought the Government to task for permitting such an injustice to be perpetrated. It was the same old story, the same old desk, the same old House,

and he sits and laughs at me as I sat and laughed at him, but he has fallen from his high ideals, and might I say that there never was a man in the seriousness of whose intent, in the unchangableness of whose high aims I had greater faith, but alas all that was in the days when he occupied a seat on this side of the House.

There is a paragraph in the Speech pertaining to a matter that if I were to make reference to it once upon a time I would be denounced as Reid's lawyer, and that alleged $10,000 salary would be thrown up to me, but now that I have cleared myself of that entanglement and am free to express an opinion, I will say as one who knows something of what he is talking about, as an old railwayman if you will, that a railway in this country can never pay, do what you will with it. You can make it wide guage or narrow guage or anything else you please, but it will be all the same. The thing that makes a railway pay is short hauls, places where there are many town and close together, but here where you have to haul a man or a barrel hundreds of miles without perhaps stopping at all to take on anyone or anything else you cannot do it. You've got to make up your minds to the fact that a railway in this country is like a lighthouse or a fog alarm. These things don't pay, but they are nevertheless a necessity.

I recognize that the Government will have a hard proposition to handle in our railway. It is the worse curse that could be wished upon the present Government that they should come into power just at this time, because of this burden alone. We must be prepared to make up our minds to spend a lot of money on the railroad. The people of the country expect too much out of this railroad. It is like a man going down town and buying a baby carriage and expecting to cart home a half ton of coal. We built a little cheap railway for small traffic and we now expect after all these years to handle abnormal traffic, a traffic which the wildest enthusiast never expected it would be called upon to cope with. Today I am in a position to say that the Government have a very big problem ahead of them, because if you advertised that this railway was being handed out as a gift to anybody who choose to take it and work it, men would be writing in and asking what size of cheque the Government would be prepared to hand them at the end of each year in return. I say again that this Government have a serious problem to handle, and I wish them luck, because of the importance of this method of transportation to our country.

The Speech from the Throne makes reference to the fact that the Government will assist in the erection of workingmen's homes. It reads like a joke to see this in the Speech, which itself states that a company has been incorporated to deal with this matter. This is a private company and has not been organized by the Government, and the Government should not by reference take credit for anything the company may do.

Mr. Speaker, a few of the many things I was looking forward to in the Speech from the Throne, and the many glowing promises made by the Hon. Prime Minister with his facile pen, were not there. It mentions nothing of these glowing promises that were outlined in the manifesto. Here is a copy of the manifesto, a yard long. Now look at the Speech from the Throne and compare it with this. When I read the manifesto of the Hon. Prime Minister, I was convinced that the people would surely return him and his party on reading

this paragraph that I am about to read.

(Here Mr. Higgins reads the paragraph in the manifesto of Mr. Squires promising a reduction in the high cost of living.)

Now isn't that a delightful paragraph. He has made more promises than he is able to deliver. "Things that are different from things that were."

Another item in the manifesto worth reading is the Hon. Minister's intentions as to profiteers. Listen to this.

(Here Mr. Higgins reads the paragraph in Mr. Squires' manifesto undertaking to take steps against profiteers and profiteering.)

In the light of this statement I did expect to see some frightful treatment meted out to profiteers, especially, to use the words of his manifesto, to "certain profiteers belonging to the wealthy dominant government class." I wonder if some of them have not been made hon. members of the Government for life. I am sorely grieved over the silence of the Government in this matter because I represent many people who thought conditions were going to improve. Its the same old story. The Government is not long enough in yet to be as fleshy as the grafters on this side. Give them a few more sessions and they will be as fine healthy looking grafters as ourselves.

In reference to the prohibition act which is a matter that will probably come up for some very important discussion, I have something to say. In his manifesto, the Hon. Prime Minister wrote a most artistic conglomeration of words without promising anything, and I must say that he hasn't fallen short of his promises.

He told about the script the Leader fo the Opposition gave, and having done this he goes on to say, (Mr. Higgins reads paragraph from Premier's manifesto regarding prohibition.) If that is not a charming way of letting a man feel he is promised something, and have him find after all he is promised nothing, then I don't know English. I will make my attitude perfectly clear. I stand for some modification of the prohibition act, for this reason that I agree and accept in its entirely the principle that prohibition has done good work. But I do say this, and I speak from personal knowledge, that things are happening every day that show the prohibition act to be a farce. It is worse than a farce. A farce is something that makes you laugh. It is more in the nature of a tragedy than a farce. You are training young men to be liars; you are training them to be perjurers, and I state as a result of observation in court that men rather than be called informers have perjured their souls, and destroyed the last vestige of manhood, the one thing that separates a man from a savage. It is as easy to change the moral nature of the people by law as to stop the sea from flowing in, and because you make a prohibition law it is foolish to sit idly by and expect perfection. There are many men today as a result of this act who do not require liquor; they have become dope fiends. Only recently some people from outside have been endeavouring to introduce opium into Newfoundland. We will have to realize that we have to deal with a difficult situation. Take an ordinary man. He feels he has as much right to a drink as anyone else In order to get a drink you make him do a thing he would not otherwise do. He gets a doctor, feigns sickness and gets a "script" for liquor. You make that man a hypocrite, or you tempt the doctor to be one in pronouncing him sick.

It is a question upon which you have all sorts of extremists. You can divide intemperates into two classes,

the men who drink to excess, and the men who don't drink at all. I will give you a case showing how the present side of it appears to me. To-day a woman came to me from Bell Island, who has nine children. Her husband was caught selling "moon-shine," and was sentenced to a fine of two hundred dollars, or jail. Of course he had not two hundred dollars and he went to jail, and that woman is waiting until tomorrow to see whether the hon. minister of justice in the goodness of his heart will not do something. Does not that woman feel the spirit of "unrest" when she thinks of the class that can go out and get a bottle of liquor, and that her husband is in jail for dealing in a drop of moonshine. By the way, Mr. Speaker, moonshine is becoming so common now that they have dropped the "moon" out of it. and the question now is will you have a drop of "shine."

There was a department of public health about to be instituted a couple of months ago, but nothing has been heard of it since. The more one thinks of this department which we looked forward to, the more one thinks something has happened. I assume that that department, like the depart-ment of trade and commerce, was not begun because of conditions altering. The honorable gentleman in the upper house, the minister of agriculture and mines, was to be the driving force in the great health organization. Today we find there is no public health organization, because he is otherwise engaged. I assume that the leader of the government cannot produce the goods, that certain of the profiteers now "belong to the wealthy domi-nant class of the government." I am afraid that the hand of the profiteer has been laid upon him, and that he has to remain content. He may do something, but I must say it comes to me as a general surprise that nothing has been indicated as yet. It is not so much that I blame him of putting this high sounding promise of dire vengeance on the manifesto, but I wish to draw the attention of the people that it is so easy to make promises, and so difficult to carry them out.

There is a part in the manifesto that says that we are going to have a reconstruction of the tariff. The taxes were going to be laid more heavily upon the shoulders of the people who could bear them.

But it is the same old story; the cry of the oppressed finds a ready ear before the election and high sounding reforms are promised, but the opening of parliament finds a sudden realization on the part of those who are looked to with such hope by the distressed and burdened people that things promised before voting day are not easily granted.

I repeat that this after election manifesto foreshadows nothing. The promised, wonderful, and uplifting are still dreams of the future, and I fear that our friends opposite in due time develop into the same fleshy "grafters" as those about whom they talked so much last fall.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that it is about time that we, as mem-bers of the House of Assembly on both sides, opened our eyes to the abuse that is handed out daily in the news-papers by a crowd of literary thugs and assassins, those contemptible, low down curs, who assail everything that is holy and sacred and who stop at nothing to satisfy their diseased minds. I want to say that I reserved this statement deliberately. I am in the happy position to say that I have neither written nor inspired to be written anything that reflected upon the character of any honourable gen-tleman in this House, and I am equally happy to say that the people of St. John's East, whom I represent, were

too intelligent to be appealed to by that sort of stuff. Certain things appeared in "The Daily Star" on Saturday night last, and if the man who wrote them had his name behind them he would be lying in hospital to-day. This filthy cur wants to brand the Opposition as a Catholic Opposition. I wish to make it clear to hon. members of this House, particularly to non-Catholics on the opposite side, that if any man can find that either myself or my colleagues in St. John's East did ourselves or authorize others to utter a single word on a platform or in private against the private character of creed of any man during the election campaign, and with our knowledge, then I shall be pleased to place my resignation in the hands of the Prime Minister.

With regard to the Hon. Minister of Mar ne and Fisheries in the general and bye-elections, I may say that he was discussed openly and honestly on his fish regulations. But anything of the kind of stuff so much prated about in the papers was never mentioned. It is up to ourselves to clear ourselves of this atmosphere. We have to make up our minds that we in th s Assembly should mould public opinion and get the people to the level that we want them.

I trust that the Government will appreciate the position that I find myself in, and that whilst I have not been in any way abusive towards the Speech from the Throne, there is at least nothing in it that I can congratulate them on. In words that are applicable "let us forgive them for they know not what they promised."

On motion the debate on the address in reply was adjourned till next session.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the hon. the minister of justice the house resolved itself into a committee of the whole to considef the bill entitled, "An Act respecting the effect and application of certain acts subsequent to the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (third series)."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The chairman from the committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the bill without amendment.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider the bill entitled, "An Act to amend "The Industrial Societies Act, 1919."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The chairman from the committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the bill without amendment.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider the bill entitled "An Act to amend chapter 41 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (third series) entitled, "Of the Newfoundland Medical Board."

The chairman from the committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the bill without amendment.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion

of the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider the bill entitled, "An Act to amend the Food Control Act, 1917."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The chairman from the committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the bill without amendment.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider the bill entitled, "An Act respecting the Department of Public Works."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The chairman from the committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the bill without amendment.

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

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave notice of question.

Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act to Provide for the Better Obtaining of Information Respecting the Cod Fishery."

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until half past ten of the clock this morning.

Mr. Higgins raised a point of order, contending that the rule of order respecting meeting hours may not be changed except by a unanimous vote of the House.

Mr. Speaker ruled otherwise.

Whereupon Mr. Higgins moved and Sir M.P. Cashin seconded, that Mr. Speaker's ruling be not sustained.

Whereupon the house divided, and there appeared for the motion, Sir M. P. Cashin, Sir John Crosbie, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Fox, Mr. Vinicombe, Dr. Jones, Mr. Moore, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Sinnott, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Sullivan—12; and against it, the prime minister, minister of justice, minister of finance, minister of fisheries, minister of education, minister of posts, Hon. Mr. Foote, minister of public works, acting minister of shipping, Messrs. LeGrow, Winsor, Small, Cheeseman, Hibbs, Gosse, Archibald, Scammell, Targett, Guppy, Jones, Samson—21; so it passed in the negative and was ordered accordingly.

The house then adjourned until ten thirty of the clock this morning.

TUESDAY, April 27th, 1920.

The house met at ten of the clock in the forenoon pursuant to adjournment.

NOTICE OF QUESTION

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—As the order paper has at this hour only been received, it being 11 a.m. only, there has been no opportunity for the questions to be forwarded to the Departments to which they relate, much less secure the information sought. These questions may be considered to be asked and will receive consideration to-morrow.

There is one question, however, which I am in a position to answer at onc, as the facts are within my own personal knowledge. I refer to the last question on the order sheet, the question of Sir M. P. Cashin concern-

ing the Royal Commission which I advised His Excellency the Governor to appoint to enquire into the resignation and affidavit of William Woodford, one of the Opposition members for Harbor Main.

In answer to that question I have to say that I am informed by His Excellency the Governor that the Honourable Sir Wm. H. Horwood, Kt., Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, has accepted His Excellency's nomination as chairman of the Commission, and that the Honorable Mr. Justice Kent and the Honorable R. K. Bishop have accepted His Excellency's nomination as the other two members of the Commission.

I can not at this moment give the exact words of the reference, but the scope of the enquiry includes the whole matter of the Woodford resignation, his affidavit and the statement therein contained.

The conduct of the enquiry will be entirely a matter for the Commission itself. It will be asked to begin the enquiry promptly and to report as soon as it is possible for them to do so.

MR. MacDONNELL:—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to presnet a petition from the inhabitants of Codroy asking that a light be erected in the dwelling house of the Lighthouse keeper at Codroy Island. This light is wanted as soon as possible, as the only means of communication that these people have, except over the road, is by the Portia, and last year the captain of the Portia refused absolutely to call there because there was no light on Codroy Island. The low lying nature of the land on that shore always presents a great difficulty to mariners, as it is an easy matter to run down Cape Anguille. The petition is signed by almost everybody in that settlement. Last year a pole was erected and a lantern was hoisted on this on fine nights, but not on rough nights, as when it was rough it was impossible for men to get out from the main land. In the words of the petitioners this did more harm than good. There was some correspondence on this matter with the Prime Minister last fall and he expressed himself as sympathetic with the idea that a light should be erected on Codroy Island. I ask that the petition be referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries and ask that the Executive Government give this matter their earnest consideration.

HON. MINISTER OF SHIPPING:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Job's Cove, signed by Rev. Fr. O'Brien and Rev. Petrie and eighty or ninety inhabitante of that place, asking that a grant be given for the repair of a road. I may say that these repairs are of vital importance not only to the people of Job's Cove but also to Burnt Point and Lower Island Cove, as in certain seasons of the year, especially in the caplin school, this road is used by a large majority of the people living around that section. Up to a few years ago the peoplec ontented themselves in carrying on their occupations by travelling over a perpendicular cliff to and from their fishing rooms, as it is the only accessible way that they can get to their fishing rooms during the fishing season. This cliff is known as a foot path and the people, with a progressive spirit and without any assistance from the government, banded themselves together and blasted out the cliff for the use of their horses and teams. The past winter was very severe with huge snow piles on the cliff so that the breaking up of spring caused floods and avalanches of snow, taking quantities of debris with it, so that at the present time it is in a practically impassible condition. In order to carry on their

season's work they ask that the small sum of $300 to make repairs to the road. I quite understand the difficulties these people have to contend with in order to try and get their livelihood from the sea. I humbly trust that this petition will find its way to the department to which it belongs and that the prayer of the petition will not go unanswered.

MR. LeGROW:—I beg to support the prayer of the petition.

HON. MINISTER OF SHIPPING:—Mr. Speaker, I also wish to present another petition from the inhabitants of Western Bay North on the subject of repairs to a road; also that a small sum of money be granted for the buying of a piece of land for a dock. No doubt, Mr. Speaker, you are familiar with that part of the coast and readily understand the great necessity there is for a dock there. In the fall of the year when storms are prevalent, people, for the protection of their property, have to haul their boats a quarter of a mile away from the sea-shore. The people ask for a small grant of $150 to buy a few yards of land to use it as a public utility. I also have great pleasure in referring this petition to the department to which it relates.

MR. LeGROW:—I have also very great pleasure in supporting the prayer of this petition.

MR. ARCHIBALD:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of the district of Hr. Grace. It is a very important petition not alone for the district of Hr. Grace, but for all on this side of the Island. I will read the petition, which is signed by Mr. R. Munn and numerous others. I have seen men on the wharf at Hr. Grace ready to go to the Labrador coast and had to remain ashore, as they were unable to get passage by steamer. I say that these people who are anxious enough and energetic enough to be early on hand to go and get a berth for the fishery should not be debarred because there is no room on the Labrador steamer the first and consequently they would have to wait for the second trip before they could get away. The petition speaks for itself and I have no doubt whaever but that the department of shipping will give it that consideration which it amply merits.

THE HON. DR. BARNES:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the petition presented by my colleague, Mr. Archibald.

MR. GOSSE:—Mr. Speaker, I also beg to support this petition.

MR. SMALL:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Channel. They ask for the grant of one thousand dollars to build a wharf there. I may say that the storm that swept this locality the last few years have washed away the wharves that have been used for the purposes of landing coal and other things and I feel satisfied that in presenting this petition because I know it is an absolute necessity and trust that it will be referred to the department to which it relates and that it will be a great benefit to the people of Channel.

Mr. Sullivan asked the Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House all copies of correspondence, memoranda and other data whatsoever in reference to or in connection with directly or indirectly any proposal, scheme or undertaking of a public nature in Newfoundland in which Harry J. Crowe either personally or in a representative capacity is interested and upon which he is or has been in communication with the present or past administration or any department thereof, particularly in reference to the acquisition of any rights, privileges or undertakings

heretofore enjoyed or carried out or proposed to be enjoyed or carried out by the Reid Newfoundland Co.

Mr. Sullivan asked the Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of this House:

(1) All correspondence between the Reid Newfoundland Co., and the Government, and between the Reid Newfoundland Co. and the Government engineer in reference to the condition of the railway and all proposals for the improvement of the inland transportation facilities generally.

Mr. Sullivan asked the Hon the Prime Minister, who owing to the absence from this Hose of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, represents the Agriculture and Mines department:

(1) What steps if any have been taken with regard to cancellation of lumber grants which are held by speculators and not developed.

(2) Is it the intention of the Government to take steps to cancel grants that are held by parties who are not fulfilling the conditions as laid down by the Crown Lands Act.

Mr. Sullivan asked the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of this House:

(1) Any correspondence he may have in connection with the establishing of life saving station between Cape Race and St. Mary's.

(2) If it is the intention of the Government to establish life saving station and further aids to navigation in this dangerous coast between Renews and Cape St. Mary's.

(3) What moneys, if any, have been sent to the district of Placentia and St. Mary's since November 30th, 1919, from the Marine and Fisheries Department.

(4) Where and to whom the money was sent?

(5) For what purpose the money was required?

(6) At whose request the money was allocated?

Mr. Sullivan asked the Hon. Minister of Finance to lay on the table of the House a statement:

(1) Showing the amounts received as profit tax from the Dominion Iron and Steel Co., and the Nova Scotia Steel Co., operating at Wabana.

(2) If both Companies have paid the profit tax? And if not, why?

Mr. Sullivan asked the Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs:

(1) To table all correspondence between the Marconi Co. or any other wireless telegraph or telephone companies in connection with the introduction of further wireless telephone stations in this country.

(2) Also any correspondence in connection with the closing down of the Directional Wireless Station at Cape Race.

(3) If it is the intention of the Government to vote sums of money for the erection of at least two more directional wireless stations, one to be erected at Cape Ray and one at Cape Chapeau Rouge at the entrance of Placentia Bay, as further aids to navigation.

(4) If any provision is being made for the erection of a small wireless telegraph or telephone plant at Oderin, Placentia Bay, or if the Government has decided to connect Oderin with Flat Islands or Baine Harbor by cable.

Mr. Sullivan asked the Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to lay on the table of the House all correspondence in connection with the dismissal of Miss Best, as telegraph operatoress at Come-by-Chance, and why a man from Trinity Bay was given the position as operator at Come-by-Chance?

Mr. Sullivan asked the Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs:

(1) To lay on the table of the House

a statement showing the number of uncomplete extensions of the telegraph system which were commenced in 1919 in the District of Placentia and St. Mary's, and when the work will be completed?

(2) What provision, if any, is being made to connect Cape Pine lighthouse with St. Shott's or Trepassey by telephone or telegraph?

(3) What work has been done on the extension of the telegraph line from Peter's River to St. Shott's?

(4) What work has been done on the extension of the telegraph line to Long Harbor, Placentia Bay?

(5) When the telegraph office is to be opened in North Harbor, Placentia Bay, the line now being built to that important settlement?

(6) What provision is being made to connect up Mall Bay, Colinet, Patrick's Cove, Arnold's Cove, North West St. Joseph's, Placentia Bay with telegraph or telephone system? (

Mr. Walsh asked the Hon. Minister of Finance, if it is the intention of the Government to increase the vote for old age pensions sufficiently so as every application for this pension can Clattice Harbor, Little Paradise and be granted?

Mr. Walsh asked the Hon. the Colonial Secretary to table all correspondence between his Department and the Reid Newfoundland Co., in connection with the closing lown of the Trepassey railway in December last.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked the Hon. the Prime Minister if the Commission to enquire into matters arising out of the Woodford affidavit has been yet appointed? If so, who are the members thereof? Whne will the Commission begin its enquiries? Within what time has it to report? And what will be the scope of its enquiries?

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled the annual returns of the Reid Newfoundland Co.

Also the Rules and Regulations under the Inspection of Foods Act.

Mr. Sulivan—(1) Notice of question, (2) Notice of question.

Mr. MacDonnell—Notice of question.

Mr. Walsh—(1) Notice of question; (2) Notice of question.

Mr. Jones—(1) Notice of question; (2) Notice of question.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—The questions asked have been given during the last few minutes, and it has been impossible to get them to the Department to elicit the information. But as to the las question asked by Sir Michael Cashin I can answer that from my personal knowledge. It is in connection to the appointment of the Royal Commission. I may say that Sir William H. Horwood has accepted nomination as chairman of the Commission and Mr. Kent and Mr Bishop have been appointed, making a total of three. I cannot give the exact words of His Excellency the Governor, but the appointments are in reference to the enquiry into the Woodford affidavit and the statements herein contained.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Is that the extent of the enquiry?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I think so, but I do not know the exact words of His Excellency. The conduct of the matter has been handed over to the commission itself and it will begin as soon as possible. I suggest that the other questions be struck off the order paper as they will be sent forthwith to the departmens.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—That report seems satisfactory.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN: — Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of adding a few words to the debate of the adoption of the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. In doing so, Sir, I wish first to congratulate the mover and seconder of

the Address in Reply. I congratulate them on their able speeches. I congratulate them as members of this House, and I hope that I will be able to congratulate them on the work they will do in this House, as I have already congratulated them for the splendid services they have performed in the past in defence of the Colony and Empire. It is regrettable that in the general election, as pointed out by the honorable gentlemen, the other men of their class had not been elected to this House. It strikes me, Mr. Speaker, that such men as the two honorable gentlemen who sit on the other side of the House, returned soldiers who sought the electorate at the last general elections, were not treated right. It appears to me that those who did their duty by this Dominion in the war have not been treated as generously as they deserveed when seeking the suffrages of the people.

A navy man offered himself for election in the District of Trinty. He answered the call of his King and Country. He came back full of honors. He then went to his native District and was turned down.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—I would like to call the hon. member's attention to the fact that there was a candidate for this side of the House who was a navy man who was also turned down.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—We were told here yesterday that Mr. Matthews was turned down because he was on the wrong side. What did he mean by saying that the candidate was on the wrong side? Did the man who had served his countrty so nobly have no right to choose his politics? When the war broke out in 1914 this House was differently constituted than it is today. What has happened since 1914? This country is in a state of depression. The world was in a state of depression. I was a member of the Government with the present Leader of the Government. I would like to bring him in memory back to that night when the message came informing us of the United Kingdom's entry into the great war, and that all the Colonies would be expected to send men. What was the financial situation then? It was an entirely new situation to us. We didn't realize what war meant, but we rose to the occasion. The gentleman who sits on my right was instrumental in getting that meeting in the C. L. B. Armoury together. After the meeting we went back to the Executive rooms. We never thought we would get 500 men, but we kept on. We had no money, not a cent. We got the men, and made arrangements with the Home Government to finance us for a short while. After a few months we were called on to send more men, and as the months went on still more, but we kept on all down those years. We financed the soldiers and sailors that went across, and looked after their dependents that they left behind, but not without some difficulty. The first loan was raised by Sir Edward Morris, I think, in 1916. Sir Edward first went across to England and satisfied himself that the Mother Country was not at all anxious to lend us any money. Sir Edward then went to the United States and raised a loan of $5,000,000, on a short term basis, three years, at 5 per cent. $3,000,000 was for the purpose of carrying on the war, and $2,000,000 to meet our railroad bill. He never dreamt that the Colony would be called on to raise another loan. He thought that the war would be over before it would be necessary for us to raise another loan; but in 1917, after the war had been going on for three years, another loan had to be raised. Meanwhile an amalgamation

was brought about with the opposition of the House, and after the amalgamation was brought about Sir Edward thought it was time for him to withdraw from politics in this country. He made arrangements with opposition and with members of his own party. There is a long story to be told in connection with that, and I will tell it before this House closes. Before leaving he found that we were financially stranded, and as Finance Minister I took the matter up with him.

I was commissioned to go to Canada and the States and find out if a loan could be negotiated there. I took time by the forelock and before we actually needed the money I moved out and when I reached the United States I found that it was impossible to raise a loan there, although Sir Edward Morris had succeeded in raising two and a half millions there the year before. An embargo was on there and no outsiders were allowed to come in and raise money. I came back to Canada and found that 5½ to 6 per cent. would have to be paid on any money we could get in that market, so I returned and laid the information I had gathered before my executive colleagues and advised them to raise part of that loan here in Newfoundland and the balance in Canada at 6½ per cent. My advice was taken and when we placed that loan on the local market we found it over-subscribed in very short order, and the Government thereupon decided to increase it. The other part of the loan had already been contracted for in Canada. The money was placed to your credit in the Bank of Montreal in this city after the amounts required for our war expenditures had been handed over to the militia department and the record office in London, and the bank paid the very fair interest of 3½ per cent. Down through these two years I sat on the other side of this House with the gentleman who is now the Leader of the Government and with the gentleman who is leader of the F.P.U. wing of the Government, while Mr. Halfyard was for part of the time Colonial Secretary. I was in close contact with these gentlemen up to the last of May or at least with some of them. When we had raised 7½ or 8 million dollars we thought we were on easy street but our troubles did not end there, for by that time we found that the short term loan raised by Sir Edward Morris was due and I had to pack my bag again and start for the United States to try and raise another loan to offset this. I felt the pulse of the United States financiers and soon found that there was nothing doing there, and as six million dollars was too much to expect our people to take up we decided to again approach Canada, and I must say that the Canadians treated us white. Hon. A. McLean, who was acting in the absence of Minister of Finance White, went out of his way to put me on the right track to raise this loan. I am sorry that the Minister of Finance is out of the House. he evidently knew I was coming to this and quietly slipped away, but I wanted to tell him how this loan was raised. This is the loan there was so much talk about and in connection with which I have been so much abused. I remained silent under this abuse, but now I will tell the story of that loan. The five million dollars was raised in Canada, the loan being advertised in the American and Canadian financial papers as well as in the local papers. Tenders were called for and were submitted by four of the leading financial Houses in Canada. Mr. Conroy was my solicitor in the matter and attended to all the legal work. The tenders were opened by him in

the finance office in the presence of the agents of the tenderers and myself. Each tenderer took a copy of all the tenders and the loan was placed with lowest which was Wood, Gundy & Co., of Toronto, one of the best Houses in Canada. They arranged the loan through the Royal Bank of Canada and gave us a guarantee that the amount to take up the short term loan on July 1st would be in the Bank of Montreal in New York by that date. That whole transaction, in spite of the high rate of exchange and all the other difficulties, was put through with a total cost to the Colony of only $125,000.

Arrangements were made to have that money in the Bank of Montreal to meet our liabilities falling due on July 1st. The finance department lost only $125,000 or $130,000 on this loan. I was a colleague with some of the Government members of today for the past 10 or 11 years, and if all that was said in the papers is correct, there is only one question for me to ask, and that is, why did those gentlemen remain and sit side by side with us. The only reason I know of for all this propaganda was to throw dust in the eyes of the public for political purposes. I have been vilified by my political opponents, but I may say here that all their vilification had the same effect on me as water on a duck's back. You have nothing to your credit, gentlemen, for the shameful, dirty, low, and despicable manner in which you fought your election. I care not whether I was elected, but I do and did object to the dirty low tactics of my opponents.

I have had some experience in the past, having been elected eight or nine times, and I have always found that it has been the custom of all parties that when the election was finished the campaign of abuse would cease But in this case the campaign of abuse did not cease, and each and every department of the government has been prostituted to find out if the previous government has done anything crooked. Even at the by-election recently held the Prime Minister in a public speech stated that Cashin's daughter had a gift of $1500 from the treasury. I have never heard such stuff before. Why was this material handed out to me?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you the story of that $1500. The first local loan ever launched in this country being for three and a half million dollars was in 1915 or 1916, and at a meeting of the executive it was decided that when the loan was put upon the colony it would sell at 98 and that 2 per cent. would go to pay the drummers and agents, etc., to sell the loan, and so it happened this loan was sold in a very short period. The finance department sent out agents and drummers and sold over four millions to the people of Newfoundland. All these agents were paid the 2 per cent. as decided upon by the executive consisting of the present prime ministers and others.

Now I will show you the state that politics has reached to-day when that Prime Minister would get up and point out my child as having received $1,500 as a gift from the Finance Department.

Oh, the Minister of Finance is back in his seat. He left the House when I was about to speak of the loan. Have I got to go over this thing again? I have been telling your party how I have been vilified and I have been telling them how this loan was raised. Here's how it was raised. Tenders were called for . . . I am now going over the same grounds again. Tenders were called for and applied for by four big financial firms in Canada. The tenders were received and opened in my office and the loan was accepted

from Wood Gundy & Co., to meet the loan raised in New York.

Now I have been held up to ridicule for the past twelve months, in reference to this loan, and my child was connected with it. When this loan was first put on the market, it was decided by Mr. Squires, that 2 per cent. would be given to those who bought it up. A. S. Rendell & Co., Parker, Bradshaw, and others spread this about, and some of their friends sold some of this loan, and when my daughter came to me and asked permission to try to sell some, I gave it because I felt there was no harm in it. I didn't think there was any harm in it then, and I am still of the same opinion, but it was taken as matter for the Prime Minister's speech, and the Finance Minister to drag that child in to their debates and point out how Cashin became rich. It does not become you to conduct your political campaign in that manner, and I am here to defend that child and to defend myself, and I fear nothing from you. It has been my reputation in this House to be open and above board in debate. As I have told you the Finance Minister went out of his way to prostitute that Department to get at me. But I assure you, Sir, you will not live long enough to get at me, and I take this opportunity to sling back in your faces the dirt which has been served out to me in the past two months. What has been in your mind is not to put men against me, but religion against religion. I may say, Sir, my best friend is a Protestant, and if I were dying tomorrow and had anything to leave my family, that I would make that man my executor. That is how I feel towards the other denominations, and I fear no contradiction of that in this House of outside. But when men become base enough to bring religion into this House and use it outside as a means to gain votes, then I never want to enter the portals of this House again. I have lived thirty years in politics in this country, and I never heard from Sir Wm. Whiteway, Sir James Winter, or the Hon. A. F. Goodridge, and why should I hear it now.

I can boast that I represent a thoroughly Catholic district, from end to end, and they elected a man who was a member of the Church of England, and in reference to that gentleman I would say, that judging by the respect the people had for him, my opinion is that he could retain his seat until he died, but he saw fit to change his views and go elsewhere. I have been a member of this House a number of years, and during those years I have served many Prime Ministers, and I have never heard it fall from my lips, when debating a question, whether it was Catholic or Protestant that was going to benefit by it. That is the school I was brought up in, and that is the school I hope to die in, and all the insinuations you have fired out at us, I throw back in your face, and I prophecy this much, that if that is going to be your conduct in the future, then it will be an easy matter to judge your end.

Now, Sir, I wish to take the first paragraph in the Speech from the Throne, but before going any further I wish to congratulate the gentlemen on this side of the House who preceded me in the debate. I must first congratulate Mr. Fox, who addressed himself so eloquently to the House on Friday night last. It strikes me that he is one of the young men, who if it is not too late will raise the dignity of the House to the position it held in the old days. I hope and trust that the future will bring forth many men of his stamp, and that the serpent that is peeping over the bar of this House will be crushed for ever, and we will hear no more of it.

I must also congratulate Mr. Bennett. He reviewed the work of the

late Government down through the last seven years, and he reviewed it in a manner that did him credit. He simply called a spade a spade and nothing more. Mr. Bennett for a part of that time was Minister of Militia, and I might say Mr. Speaker, that the Department was looked after thoroughly by Mr. Bennett. That Department was a new Department, and one that men of Mr. Bennett's class had no experience in, and I think it is wonderful to take a man out of civilian life and put him in that Department, and have him handle it successfully. In other countries, such as Britain, Departments of this kind are run by old experienced trained men. Mr. Bennett was not one of those, but he did credit to that Department. What is there against him in that Department? Has there been anything done since that Department was taken from him? That Department was handed over to the Government in November past, and I say that that Department also has been prostituted. That place was broken into, and the records of men who fought for us were laid open to the eyes of the public. When we find men in this House who are base enough to go in there and hand out the record of any individual amongst our soldiers or sailors, am I not right in saying that that Department has been prostituted, and only for public sentiment came to the rescue, the record of every soldier or sailor, who was an opponent of the present Government would be handed out to the public of this Colony, but public sentiment came to the rescue and prevented that. Now I am not prepared to say who is chief of that Department, but the Prime Minister is chief of all Departments, and he must know who handed out these records to the public. The like of this was never done before in any country, that the record of any soldier should be handed out and made public matter of, but I mention this as a sample of the low, despicable means used by the present Government to get here, and I wish to say that if I could get in in no other way than that, that I would rather stay out.

The House then rose until 3 p.m.

At three of the clock the House resumed.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the Leader of the Opposition, I beg to lay upon the Table of the House the annual returns of the Reid Newfoundland Co., for period July 1918 to June 1919, also the rules and regulations under the Inspection of Foods Act of 1914. Under section 9 of the Act these regulations must be tabled in the Legislature during the first week of the session.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Mr. Speaker, when recess was called I was dealing with the first paragraph of the Speech from the Throne. I was pointing out to the House how the publis departments have been prostituted, and while we may forgive many of the prostitutions there is no excuse for the prostitution of the Militia Department. I happened to be out of the Colony when this attack was made on the department. I pointed out this morning that the attack was made on the Government of the day. The department is today under the Prime Minister; he is looking after it and it is under his protection that this prostitution took place. I call it prostitution. Now this matter has drawn my attention. It is an article in The Daily Star this evening under the heading: "Let the Public Judge." Now I understand this was caused by some controversy in the papers over certain treatment handed out to returned soldiers. The returned soldiers mentioned did not see eye to eye with the present Government. They put forward their claims and they

were turned down and a discussion arose. The Star is owned and controlled by the Prime Minister and nothing can appear in it without his permission. I am going to read the article but I am not going to read the record. I would not debase myself to read it. (Reads article.)

Now here is the letter of Private Doran and Private Tracey. (Reads article.) Now these two soldiers or sailors, as the case may be, have this treatment handed out to them although they have, according to this communication (letter) given nearly five years' service for their King and Country. Now they have been basely treated by The Star as you can read between the lines.

This was printed in large type and handed out to the whole world. These two men enlisted, and were prepared to lay down their lives for their King and Country. They have had some faults. We are not all saints. How many of us, if we wore our skins on our sleeves, could throw a stone at the other. I say no more on this matter now, gentlemen; public sentiment has turned down this kind of thing. But I would ask the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to give warning to any individual or department that is going to treat their brother soldiers in this way. Why try to debase and pull down those men in the mire? That is the thing that is being done, so I serve notice on you to keep this matter in mind and see that a repetition of this thing does not occur.

The second paragraph of the Speech from the Throne makes reference to the donations to this Government by the Admiralty of three ships that are to be used in the various services of the country. I appreciate the donations from the British Admiralty to this Colony. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that this matter had the attention of the late Government. Mr. Piccott, through the late Government, put this matter before the Admiralty. He was anxious to have a seagoing tug on hand at all times. Mr. Piccott, who backed this movement and I think had several interviews with the Governor, also placed the matter before Sir Edgar Bowring, who promised him that he would put the matter before the Admiralty. The present Government should take no credit for this thing because the present Government were members of the late Government. I recognize that it is necessary to have a good sea-going tug. The cost of maintaining such a boat will be heavy, but we should be prepared to stand it because in one night she might do service that would be many times her value. Take the Florizel disaster. There was nothing in the harbor with steam up that could be of any assistance. This, Mr. Speaker, is a step in the right direction. We should have a boat here ready at any moment to go to sea and rescue lives. Take the case of the Kristianiford. There were some 500 lives on board. Fortunately she was fitted with wireless, and could send out the S. O. S. call, and the Sable I. on her way from Nova Scotia went to her rescue and succeeded in saving all the lives. The action of the Government in this matter has ample justification. It is possible, says the Speech, that one of these boats will be used as a coastal boat. That may or may not be so. A coastal boat and a warship are two different things. The Admiralty have several of these boats on their hands that are no good for coastal boats. The boats are very narrow and shallow, and for this reason they would be of no value as coastal boats. This I presume is the reason Dover turned the offer of two of them down.

It is not much of a gift after all. Newfoundland did her part in the

war and if we do get a few old depleted warships it is not so much. Moreover, Sir, I understand that ships of this class burn from 30 to 50 tons of coal a day, and if this is so, in the case of those we are getting they will be found to be a liability rather than an asset to the Colony.

The third paragraph of the Speech from the Throne reminds me of the French Shore question, although it refers to the Labrador boundary.

For many years a dispute has been pending between the Porvince of Quebec and this Colony in relation to the boundary between Newfoundland and Quebec on the Labrador Peninsula. An agreement has been arrived at as to the submission of the dispute to the adjudication of His Majesty's Privy Council, and it is thought probable that some settlement of this long outstanding controversy may be made during this year.

Do I understand, Mr. Minister of Justice, that this case is now before the English courts?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—It won't come on this year, but the two governments are in conference on the matter and it will be proceeded with as early as possible.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—What counsel has been engaged to represent this colony?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—The government's solicitors are engaged and I understand they have retained Sir John Simon.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—I take it some local men will be sent to represent us also?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I propose to go myself.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—I congratulate you.

The fourth section of the speech deals with the fish regulations. Shortly after the present Government came into power these regulations were sprung on the country. The minister of marine and fisheries apparently took the matter into his own hands and the regulations published by him were expected to become law. In this matter I am with him upto a certain point. I remember last fall when the export trade was at a stand and the whole of Water Street stood aghast, but Mr. Coaker made a mistake by not taking the trade into his confidence before launching his regulations. I take it that he took it into his head that he should stop the export of fish until the markets were prepared to pay the price asked for it with cash against documents and instead of calling the Board of Trade together he gave it out that he was the Minister of Fisheries and that he was backed by the Government and was prepared to put these regulations into effect whether the exporters liked it or not. If he was independent I would not mind it so much, but he was an exporter himself and took upon himself to enter into a contract with two or three others without saying "I beg your pardon." It was marvellous we did as well as he did. He took out a couple of men who knew nothing about such matters and called them an advisory board and turned the back of his hand to those who did, with the result that he put the country and himself on Queer Street. He simply took it upon himself to make a big fish deal with Hawes, and if he thus laid himself open to suspicion he has only himself to blame for the discreditable stories that were circulated about him.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—Tell us what the story was?

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Yes I will. It was that you feathered your own nest and sold your own fish first. While

many cargoes were rejected there were no F. P. U. cargoes amongst them.

When I was in Montreal a few weeks ago I could have sold a cargo of fish at $14.00 a quintal f.o.b. I wired a firm here but they replied that the buyers would have to comply with the terms of Mr. Coaker's regulations and when I submitted these terms to the prospective buyer he wouldn't look at the fish.

Where are you now, Mr. Coaker: You have thrown up the sponge, according to the speech of Sir J. C. Crosbie and the messages received in town. We are in a very humble position to-day if you ask me, when 250,000 people have to bow to you to get your permission to ship their fish. Mr. Cheeseman could tell you all about it if he only had pluck enough to stand up. What is the history of Sam Harris, a poor fisherman 30 or 40 years ago, who went to sea in a "bully boat." Do you know what that is. He gradually grew to the position he is to-day, but he couldn't have done it if the existing fish regulations were then in force. Thirty years ago every fish was marketed to St. John's to be sold for shipment across, but you don't find this situation to-day, yet we will soon drift back to the days of one man dictation, if things go on as they are going. Has a man not the right to catch his fish and sell it in any market of the world and get any price he can for it? But, what is the position to-day? You have to wire in to the Marine and Fisheries Department and beg for a permit to be allowed to ship your fish. Mr. Hutchings (a capable and obliging official) wires back perhaps that Mr. Coaker is at Port Union and that he cannot grant permission.

This is one man rule. I find that you have put on the restrictions, not through the house but by the authority of an old rusty war measures act. Let us bring it into this legistalure and let us discuss it. Water Street men are back in the same old rut. They can't ship fish against documents. Your policy of shipping fish in this manner will drive trade out of the country. Fish is a perishable article. We have got to wait until it arrives before we get any money. If it is up to the standard we get full price for it, but if it is inferior we must give a rebate. Now you want to change all that and you put a shipment of fish on the same level as you would a shipment of flour from New York. And then you say legislation must be passed compelling the fisherman to make his fish properly. Why, it is enough to make a fish laugh. It is harder to make bad fish than it is to make good fish.

I have no hesitation in saying that it is easier to make good fish than bad fish. It requires 300 per cent. more labor to make bad fish than good.

MR. CHEESEMAN—I agree with you.

SIR M.P. CASHIN—I thank Mr. Cheeseman for his honest expression of opinion. I am sure the house appreciates it and that the people of the gallery appreciate it. Mr. Cheeseman is a practical man and I am glad that he coincides with me.

I agree that the exporter is the man that should be got after, and I want to tell the minister that if he wishes to standardlze the fish it is the exporter that he should get after, Take you and I. We buy the fish just as it comes, and it is up to Mr. Brown or Mr. Jones who purchases it as an exporter to see that the standard is kept up. When the fish is brought to St. John's it is culled and assorted, the merchantable in one bulk, the maderia in another bulk, and West Indies in another, and the slimey in another, and it should be exported

accordingly. The merchant is the man to get after, if you get after him you are doing something, but you have no right to come here to legislate according to your present ideas, and it is ridiculous to put such a paragraph in the speech from the throne.

I would like to ask the minister of marine and fisheries what has happened to our herring industry. I see no mention of it at all in this document. Fish regulations are all very well, but codfish is not herring, and caplin in not squid. Now we had a herring fishery in the colony a few years ago, and what has happened to it. If you were to provide regulations regarding the herring in the same way as you planned with regard to codfish, than I am with you. Our herring fishery a few years ago was worth nearly a million dollars, but to day it is gone, and who is to blame for it? When I was in New York last yearI went down to one of the piers there and saw a consignment of herring from this colony. I was invited down by a merchant belonging to this city who was in the herring business, and when I was brought her I recognized on arrival a thousand berrals of herring that were stored there, and which had not been cleaned of the Newfound land mud; the barrels had been rolled through the mud and the mud still stuck to them. Then they were mark ed No. 1 herring but that they were not No. 1 you might judge from the fact that in three barrels which were opened for inspection the top tier only was large, the next tier smaller, and the next tier smaller still, and in some cases they were packed without even the gut having been taken out. This is the kind of thing which is going to New York as No.1 Scotch Cured Herring from Newfoundland. That kind of thing may have been all rightwhile the war was one, when there was a premium on this class of food, but to day we cannot sell herring which are in that condition. In New York there has been a great sounding of trumpets about what we are going to do with regard to regulating the class of fish which we are exporting, but it strikes me that this is about the very first matter that should be tackled. It is one of the things that is not mention-in the speech from the throne, and that it is a very important one I am sure all the hon. members of the House will agree.

With regards to the fifth paragraph in the speech from the throne regarding the closing of the militia department, I agree with this to a certain extent. I agree that it is high time to close the militia department, if the conduct of those in charge is been closed. This office has done cord office in London has already very good work in its day. I do not to continue as it has been. I note that the Newfoundland pay and re-agree with the position which refers to the civil re-estabuishment committee. I believe these gentlemen are doing their very best in the interest of the returned soldier, and while there are returned soldiers at large as at the present time, I think it is the duty of this government and every other government to see that these men are taken care of and given every atteneion. Nothing that can be done for them is too much. They went over there and laid down their lives for our security, and so far as I am concerned I am prepared to add another million or two millions to the debt of the Colony if it would serve their interests and enable them to get a square show. I have noticed in an advertisement in one of the daily papers saying that the Government intends to give to each soldier a small plot of land which he can cultivate. Well, eighty per cent. of the

soldiers and sailors who went across must have been fishermen, and I take it that you can never make a farmer out of a fishermen, that is the history of Newfoundland. The fisherman is prepared to have his little plot of land and to cultivate it as far as he can, but when the fishery comes round he is sure to give up the farming; that is my experience. The very minute the caplin strike he is gone, therefore I regard this advertisement and this promise as a mere camouflage. Such a proclamation in such a Colony as this is only a joke.

If we live to come back here next year, which I hope we will, we will see that not two per cent., no, not even one per cent. of the returned soldiers will be following up farming. Would you expect a man to farm the South Side Hills or the Blockhouse? Well, these places are better than many places up the country, where these men will be asked to farm the land, and apart from that I am sure that the men from Bonavista Bay or Trinity Bay or St. John's are not going to move to Bay of Islands in order to take up farming.

I think I may say that while the Morris government was in power, and while the Lloyd government was in power, they each did as much as possible for the returned soldiers. Their pay was increased among other things, and we went as far as to promise that with regard to pay, Newfoundland would place itself upon the same level as Canada. We did all we could for the returned soldier and his dependents. Mention is made here of building a hospital, but I do not know if this is necessary except for tubercular patients, and that institution was started last year when the soldiers started to come home. The proposition was put up to the government that is was absolutely necessary to take care of these men on arrival and so we bought the premises in the east end and fitted it up for a temporary hospital, with cots and everything else necessary, and when it was found that additional accommodation was wanted for those afflicted with tuberculosis, had the ground surveyed out around Bowcock's Farm.

We took care of the returned soldiers in every way that was available, that is what the Hon. Mr. Halfyard and I did. Mr. Halfyard was a member and a Minister of the Crown in the late Government. Now the present Government, of which Mr. Halfyard is a member, tells us what provision they are making for the returned soldiers, although Cashin and Halfyard went to the last ditch to get this building, in fact we gave the contract to a man to do the work.

There is another paragraph in the Speech from the Throne which says that "The Rev. (Major) Nangle has been placed in charge of matters connected with the concentration and registration of the graves of our heroic dead in Europe." This paragraph was referred to last night by the late Minister of Militia, the Hon. Mr. Bennett, and also by the Hon. Mr. Higgins and other gentlemen. And I agree with them that the Rev. (Major) Nangle is the right man in the right place. He is young, energetic and enthusiastic for that work. We have implicit confidence in him and know that his work will be accomplished to the satisfaction of all, especially to the relatives of our deceased soldiers.

Here is another paragraph which I think is as old as the House itself.

The revenue for the last fiscal year showed a substantial surplus over expenditure. On the other hand, there have been large expenditures not included within the scope of last year's estimates which it will be necessary

to legalize. In spite of these large disbursements the revenue was more than sufficient to meet current expenditure. It must be remembered, however, that practically the whole of the very large expense incurred in connection with the Department of Militia and in the matter of pensions for soldiers and sailors and their hospital treatment and civil re-establishment was borne on capital account.

Here is another statement: "The estimates have been subject to considerable revision and have been based upon the report of the civil service commission appointed by my late ministers." That is correct. The late Government appointed Inspector O'Rielly and two other gentlemen to go into the whole civil service and adjust all the salaries and take evidence, if necesasry, to put the civil servants on a right and proper basis, and to recommend a living wage to all. That commission has not reported yet. I hope when they do report that the civil servants of this Colony will be granted sufficient to keep them properly and independent as they should be kept. Did you ever hear a lot of words like this meaning nothing, but simply handed out to the ordinary man to swallow. My ministers propose to submit to you for your careful consideration a bona fide statement of the moneys which are estimated to be necessary to cover the expense of the public services of the Colony for the coming fiscal year. They are of the opinion that the practice which has grown up during recent years of submitting estimates far below the actual anticipated expenditure, trusting to provisions being made under the head of "supplemental supply" at a subsequent session of the Legislature for the authorization of over-expenditure, should be discontinued as far as practicable.

The whole thing is spoiled by the four words "as far as practicable." We are told that supplemental supply is going to be done away with and that the spending of monies in future, according to this paragraph, will be all done in this Assembly. There will be no salaries raised or increased until such time as voted by this House. At the end of that paragraph you will notice the words "should be discontinued." Here's what that amounts to. At the first meeting of the executive council on Water Street, after they are through with this House, a member of the Executive, on behalf of a constituent or friend, asking for an increase of salary. May be there will be concessions asked that will involve anywhere from ten to twenty thousand dollars. They will be discussed and pronounced upon and an Order-in-Council taken to Government House, through the Colonial Secretary. The Governor signs the order and the Finance Department will pay this expenditure authorized by the Executive. Such cases will happen at ninety per cent of the meetings held by the Executive during the next twelve months. When the House meets next year there will be a much larger supplemental supply than is being brought down this year. Yet we are told in a paragraph of the Speech from the Throne that supplemental supply is going to be done away with.

The Speech from the Throne also says that the Department of Marine and Fisheries, which may be considered one of the most important departments of the administration, will be re-organized; an information bureau and scientific research department will be established; a commission will be appointed to put into operation laws for the standardiza-

tion of fish and the improvement of the cure thereof. Trade commissioners and other agents will be appointed from time to time until Newfoundland is suitably represented in all its principal fish markets. Legislation will be introduced to provide for the enforcement of such regulations as my ministers may consider necessary to protect the interests in foreign countries of those who ship fish to the foreign market.

Does this mean that this Department is going to be conducted as in the past? A fishery report collected around the Island through the aid of wireless and telegraph stations? I take it that that is the meaning of the words "Information Bureau." As to the words "Scientific Research." Well, they are as old as the Department itself. Some scientific man from some other part of the world, I suppose, will be imported here as in the past and be attached to the Department, or does it mean that a staff of men will be sent around the island on a steamer taking temperatures, soundings, etc., like they do in Norway and Sweden. Anyway, I suppose it will come out in the bill that the minister intends to bring down. In the past a Mr. Nielsen was brought here. He was a good man but he did not fill the bill. A Mr. Flett was also brought here to reorganize the herring fishery. You know what hapepned? It was during election time and this visitor was used as a catch cry. He was going herring fishery was going to be prosecuted scientifically and systematically. Dr. Barnes was a member of the House at the time. He helped to get him here. We were told that Flett was going to introduce into the North and West the system in vogue in Scotland and Norway. This man Flett arrived after certain opposition in this Assembly. He was here a considerable time before he pitched his tent in Green and Bonne Bays. What did we find for steam drifters? Two western boats sailing up in Bay of Islands and Bonne Bay with a foresail and mainsil jogging along towing nets behind them. This isthe great industry we were told at election time was going to be reorganized by the Government if returned to power. The net result of it all was that the herring fishery was seriously hampered.

Purchasers protested against the quality of herring marketed and I can give an explanation because I was in New York when something of this kind happened. I am glad to see from the speech from the throne this matter is going to be taken up again and I hope that when it is taken up again and I hope that when it is taken up this time something beneficial will be done, and that he will not be long in the position we are in to-day in which we find the country with none of the herring markets controlled by us during the war, practically ruined through our own fault. Perhaps I will be also blamed as I was one of the government of the time. Well I am prepared to accept responsibility. It is a good idea to see that a step is to be taken to have Newfoundland suitably represented in the fish markets by a commissioner or an agent. A man should be sent as an agent to Europe, Canada, South America, and the United States. I take it, it is the right thing to do. It is a step in the right direction. I think it was about thirty years ago that Messrs. Goodridge and Perez were sent to South America and after they handed in their report nothing further was done in the matter. According to the speech from the throne something is going to be done to protect our interests in the foreign markets and the fish that is shipped there. I hope that when the minister hands down this bill he will outline how he proposes to put

it into effect. I take it that it is going to cost a lot of money to send men, but I say this, that we will get value for our money if we get the right men to send and they do their duty. Capt. John Lewis was sent to Gibraltar and did great service and saved a lot of money fro the country while the department was under the charge of Sir John Crosbie. Hundreds of thousands of dollars were saved to this colony. Having proof that he had accomplished his mission, there is no reason why we should not have an agent and representative in each and every fish centre on the other side of the water, as well as Canada, the United States, and South America. The United States would be a great market for our fish, but we cannot get it while the present system of curing fish is continued, and while that continues we are not going to get a market there for our dry codfish in the manner in which it is shipped. The old members of this house know the history of the Mackinson codfish process. These dry fish have to go through a certain process before they are fit for consumption. You have got to take it and wash it and then change the water on it quickly, and unless this is done, it will get in a stench which is objectionable, but if you water the fish and change the water, then, in about thirty or forty hours, it ought to be sufficiently fresh for food. In America, if you get some of this fish and put it in water and then place it in the hands of inexperienced persons, the authorities would come round and have the party arrested. This is correct, and it is no joke. When I was in America in the basement of a hotel I put some of the dry cod in some water and the manager came along and said "that stinks." This fish was perfect. Now when the American fishermen catch their fish they shovel it over with salt. The fish absorbs all the salt possible. Putting it in boats and turning water on it does not take the salt out of it. It is prepared by being allowed to compress itself by its own weight and is then laid on a flake and later put in three or four pound boxes and sent throughout the States. This fish is not attractive to a Newfoundlander at first trial, but after a few meals you will like it just as well as our shore fish. It must be recognized that under the present system we can never get our fish on the American market. When our fish reaches Brazil it is all cemented together. Do we intend to have at the end of the present year a fishery as successful as before. On this point I was talking before noon. We are going to have a number of Frenchmen competing. While the war was on everything on the other side was closed down as far as fish was concerned. Take the Frenchmen who are going to be our great competitors. Quite a lot of them are, or, at least, will be fishing on the Grand Banks this year. I learned from Frenchmen from St. Pierre, when I met at Halifax, that France is sending out here this year sixty-five or seventy new trawlers. This fishery we know nothing about. Some years ago a trawler was brought to Bowring Bros. from Grimsby. She was a lovely boat. about five hundred tons, and was placed in the command of Captain Jackman, although she had a first class man with her. She had all the necessary equipment. She was used in the fish business, but she no fish as the net was down near the bottom and, of course, the fish were afloat. Later she was in the command of Captain Kennedy, of Conception Bay, and she had no better success. He fished up along the Gulf and other shores but got no fish. Still they are getting fish by the same

method on the other side. The French fished down near St. Pierre after this happened, and during the months of July and August they got no fish, until in the later months they discovered what was wrong. When the caplin are in the fish are afloat. The fish do not swim low when caplin are around.

When this trawler of Bowrings came out here they knew nothing about this. She set a contrivance for July and August the same as for the other months of the year. They did nothing, but this year the French are sending 65 or 70 trawlers. Their coaling station will probably be Sydney. Last year one of the trawlers was ready to go across to France, but the captain thought he would have a try at the banks before going. He went out on Sunday and the following Saturday night he returned to St. Pierre with 4000 quintals of fish, filled to the hatches. Canada and the United States will have steam trawlers. If the French are going to be our competitors, as they have been our competitors in the past, and they are going to have steam trawlers, where are we going to be. We are always behind time. Mr. Speaker, we have to go very cautiously with those regulations which have been manufactured by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for his own benefit. We have now on our hands a quarter of a million quintals of fish with the market blocked. We will have the new fish going to the market before half the old is disposed of. The Western fishery this year has been a failure, but last year all the bankers had from 1000 to 1200 quintals each. If the messages which have been read to this House are correct, what is going to happen to our stock of fish? How is the whole situation going to be solved. The price on everything that is imported into the country is going up and the price of our chief product is going down, and may be considerably reduced in price next season. Where are the people going to get the money to buy the necessities of life? The only suggestion we can make to the fishermen of the country is to pack their bags and get out of the country. Why don't the Government put something in the speech that you had in your manifesto last fall. What is your program for the fishermen. I saw the other day by one of the papers that 100 young men were leaving for Canada and the United States by one boat and there were many more leaving shortly. They are leaving because they can get nothing to do in their native country. These men are full of energy and the spirit of progress, and should be given something to do in their own country.

There is a reference in the speech to the survey of ships. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that it is the outside vessels that are being brought in here that are being lost and that are causing so much trouble. Several hundred ships are being brought in here from Lunenburg and Halifax. Now the life of a Lunenburg vessel is from seven to twelve years, but they are generally brought into Newfoundland when they are over that age.

I can ask you, Mr. Speaker, a seafaring man yourself, what in your opinion is the life of the Lunenburg vessel. You know, Sir, it is from seven to ten years. The Newfoundland trade bought up everything they could lay hands on in Lunenburg and Halifax, brought them here and put them into their foreign trade. They were nice looking vessels, but what happened to them. They left here and one by one they went down. They were never as good as the Newfoundland built vessels. It was the Lunenburg vessels that sold the most fish to Lloyd's. I hope Sir, we will see more about this matter than the mere mention of it in the speech, as it demands immediate consideration.

In the creation of the Department

of Posts and Telegraphs, the Government found it necessary to remove the Hon. Dr. Robinson, a man who had the confidence of the people of the Colony, and who has it today. When he took hold of that department he put it on a sound basis. He was a man politicians could not easily influence; that was his only crime, and it was for that reason alone the present Government found him out of office. At the same time, Sir, I have implicit confidence in the present occupant of that office. I sat with him for some time on the executive of the National Government, and I know him to be a man worthy of admiration.

The formation of a Department of Education is the next paragraph of the Speech. This is so far shrouded in mystery, but I presume the present Government has taken the heads of the different denominations, who are the present recognized heads of the educational departments, into its confidence and it will be time enough to discuss this when the bill is brought in.

Another paragraph in the Speech is devoted to the reorganization of the Department of Agriculture and Mines, but there is nothing with reference to the industries which come under the direction of this department, namely, mines and minerals, and pulp and paper. I contend, Sir, that here is room in this country for three or four concerns like the Harmsworth Co., and if this is so, why does not the Government get busy and try to get them established here. Look what it would mean to the country. It would give employment to those hundreds of men who cannot make a full living out of the fishery and keep them in the country whilst they now have to go outside in search of employment. If the Government is to do nothing but insert a paragraph of this kind in the Speech from the Throne and sit idly here and then go back to the country after four years, they will not be doing their duty and have no business here at all. We shall be in a position to judge this in time. The same thing applies to our mines and minerals. It is the duty of the Government to supply the ways and means for doing something in this direction, but evidently they do not intend to do anything in the way of explaining those very important resources. The following paragraph relates to our coastal services and railway connection, and reads as follows:

The problem of both coastal and inland transportation, which are of the first importance to the industrial welfare of the country, are receiving most careful consideration at the hands of my ministers, who hope to be in a position to submit for consideration at this session of this Legislature some practical proposals for more efficient service.

This paragraph was written for a purpose and the man who wrote that was scared to come out and say what he intended. Did it strie you before, Mr. Speaker, that this paragraph was put there for a purpose to camouflage the issue. It was a god-send to have railroads when the ice blocked our shores and prevented our ships from getting in with the necessities of life. This railway has done much good, now what is the history of it? I have seen much in the press of what has been happening on the line, but there it is, it's ours, what are you going to do about it?

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—Go to it.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—Oh, carry on with your Dutch courage.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—British courage.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—British, not, you. You are a slacker, I'd take

off my hat to you if you had British courage. British courage over there (pointing to Small and LeGrow.) But not you.

Now to get back to the railway. What are you going to do about it? That road has been in existence for 2 years. It is a 50 lb. rail and you are running 70 and 880 ton engines over it. It has been scheduled that this railroad would last 20 years with 30 ton engines and it takes a very small sum to tell how long an 80 ton engine will take to wear a 50 lb. rail. Something must be done, we mustn't let the people go across country in cars and come back in boxes, or perhaps be burned and not come back at all. Don't camouflage the issue because you can't, if you are going to tax the people to the tune of several million dollars. The rails, in places, have been worn as flat as an iron hoop, and you can stand a mile away from a moving train and feel the rails moving under your feet from the force of the approaching train. This railway was built under schedule at a time when people had no idea of the conditions of to-day, they knew nothing of war, or the conditions which were imposed upon the company by increased traffic due to it. That railway should be fenced off and you should get busy, as Prime Minister of this country, to put that road in a condition for traffic. You are taking your life in your hands when you cross the country on this line. I will go further and say that many of the bridges now existing were built for 30 or 35 ton engines and to-day we are running 70 and 80 ton engines their cars over them. Now gentlemen, don't talk here for six weeks and close this House without moving in this matter, but a railroad we cannot do without, and it will cost the Government in my estimation ten million dollars, and then you won't have a first class railroad. Some people say now is the time to build a wide guage railroad but to do it would take forty million dollars, and you cannot touch it, but you must remodel the old one. The people are demanding it. Now that we have not the steamers we had a few years ago, and it will take some years to replace them, there is only one answer, and that is, we must have a railroad. When this matter comes up for dissay about it. I don't care who fixes cussion I am going to have further to the railroad. I am going to support what is right and just for the people of the country, and the sooner you get some competent man or corporation to do it, the better. For the accidents that have happened in the past we were blessed, and we were accused of neglecting our duty, which is untrue, now it is in your hands and it is your duty to remedy conditions. I appeal to the leader of the F.P.U. is what I have said is not true. Is it not the duty of the Government to do something quickly? If it is Reid's duty to repair the railway make him do it, and if not, take it and do it yourselves. Get a loan of seven or eight million dollars. That railroad has to be handled by the Government of the day, and if they do not do it, they are not going justice to the people who sent them here. Every industry is held up. You will meet a man and he will say: Have you any pull with Mr. Reid? You say I don't know whether I have or not. Why? And he will tell you he is a month waiting for a car from the Reid Nfld. Co. This is as true as the Gospel which was read on Sunday.

Take the coastal service . The coastal service today is demoralized. I say it is demoralized and I will prove it, and I want to say a word on behalf of the government that has gone out. As members on the other side of the house will remember (because it was part of the proposition when their contract expired), in 1919 Bowring Brothers asked for 100% on passenger

rates and freight rates. After some consideration it was decided to make them an offer for the two coastal boats, and Sir John Crosbie as Minister of Shipping asked them their figure. They wanted a fifteen year contract, and when things get back to their normal condition 100% on freight and passenger rates If Bowring Brothers made money out of that coastal contract, and we know they did, how much money would they make under those increases if conditions got back to normal in two or three years. As is known by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries we made an offer of 50% which they refused. We had messages from all the northern districts to give Bowring Brothers the contract as the handling of it by them had been satisfactory, and it was the general sentiment that Bowring Brothers should get thecontract. We sent messages in reply and pointed out to them that Bowring Bros, required 100% on passenger and freight rates, and the response was that we should not tolerate it. We felt the same way, so after some deliberation we decided to make them an offer for the two coastal boats, and Bowring Brothers were approached on the matter, and Sir Edgar Bowring, who was here at the time, offered the two coastal boats for two hundred thousand dollars, which was very reasonable. The Government bought them and they were put under the management of the shipping department, under Sir John Crosbie, and we gave it a trial. We put on the 50% on the old rate, and after some time we found we could make money with only a 50% increase, and right up to the time Sir John Crosbie left that department these boats were in credit at 50%. It was sufficient satisfaction for us to know that we did the right thing by the people of the colony. I make that statement, and the Minister of Shipping can contradict it if he will. And today we find that those two boats, running under the present management will require over 100% to square their deficit. If that is correct I am sorry for the head of that department. There is no reason why he should not do as much in that department as any other man. I don't expect as much from him as from Sir John Crosbie, but Sir John Crosbie was well in credit when he left that department. Now. than, where are we today on coastal boats.

Take the Reid Nfld. Co., there are two of them gone. Take the Portia. She is up at the dock with the bottom out of her. Take the Prospero. I don't know how she is now, but I know she had an accident some time ago at Lewisburg. I understand there is another coastal service in vogue at the present time that we know nothing about; that there is a boat running from St. John's to Grand Bank. How much is being paid for this service I don't know or what the arrangements are.

MINISTER OF SHIPPING—She is paid a small subsidy for the freight and passengers .

SIR M. P. CASHIN—What subsidy is she receiving.

MINISTER OF SHIPPING—I don't just remember, but I will get the information for you.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—There are other parts of this Island just as deserving as Grand Bank and Fortune. There are parts of Placentia Bay and the Southern Shore which are just as much entitled to this service. When this matter comes before the house I will have more to say on it. I don't think it is fair that a steamer should be taken and paid for out of the public funds of the colony, and sent direct to any one port. The position of the coastal service of today is different altogether. It appears

to me it is going backward instead of forward.

Now what is the coal situation in this city today. It is that several industries are held up and steamers are held up here with not a lump of coal in town to give them. No such thing happened in this colony during the five years of the war. There was no shortage in the provisions or any other line, much less coal. While we were fighting the bye-election last fall we saw what was coming and we told the people of St. John's West that coal would be $18 a ton by the end of March. We were laughed at and ridiculed. There must be an answer to it. There is lots of coal in Sydney and lots of tonnage to bring it here. What has the minister in charge to say about this matter? Coal advanced in price in thec ity because of the shortage. And then if you did get coal after paying $19 a ton for it, one wouldn't mind, but you can shovel out the ashes as fast as you can shovel in the coal. Everybody is complaining. Even if we were dishonest, as alleged, we gave the warning to the people of St. John's. There is not a lump of coal in the city today with the ice in as far as Cape St. Francis. I would like to ask the minister of shipping what coal is now en route to this country?

HON. MINISTER OF SHIPPING:—No grave fears need be felt.

SIR M..P. CASHIN:—Is it not your duty to find out if there is any coming and if you do not know how you should ask some other member of the government to show you. If you had consulted Sir John Crosbie he could have chartered you a vessel inside of 48 hours. You were fooling with the Jobs in New York for a cargo of coal that fizzled out. You have no confidence in those who run against you for a seat in this house, and that is why you would not consult any of those gentlemen. What a lovely spectacle we have in this house tonight as minister of Shipping? The Shipping Department has neither steamer coming with coal nor do they know where to get a steamer. If all the other Departments are being conducted as well as that one, it would have been better for the people of this country to realize that "the devils they knew were better than the devils that they didn't know." But when we were there they had a right to keep us there. What a lovely position to be in; not a lump of coal for any industry or for household purposes, or for any strange steamer that might happen to drop in here to-morrow. The sealing steamers, after burning all their coal, are all back. Why not secure some of them?

HON. MINISTER OF SHIPPING:—The firemen refused to go.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Why not pay the firemen. Why not the Government take the steamers from the owners, and you pay the firemen; we want the coal. That is what we did. The position is ridiculous with regard to the firemen and that cannot be defended by any individual member in this House. In New York there are thousands of tons of coal that could be bought at $9.40 a ton, but you were not big enough to rise to the occasion to get this coal. That is one of the things that accounts for Water Street looking so despondent to-day. From one end to the other you can see marked depression on every man's face. Every broker will tell you that there is no business doing, whereas last year there was plenty. There must be a reason for it. The people on this or the other side of the water were not unanimous last year in opposition to fish regulations, now the position is the reverse. Messages have been received by Sir John Crosbie and other messages have been received within the past twenty-four hours that these regulations have

ruined us. Regarding the coal problem again, why does not the Minister of Shipping go to Canada or the United States to get steamers to try and relieve the present shortage. When I was in Halifax recently there were 15 wooden ships there and several of them could be chartered for St. John's And at Sydney I was told by Mr. Dickie, one of the members of the Dominion Iron & Steel Company, that it was not impossible to get a steamer. t appears that nobody seems to care .bout the coal shortage in the colony. Take up the government papers in the afternoons and you will not find a word in them about the coal shortage, but you will find plenty of political abuse and about how Cashin is trying to deceive the people. I repeat that the minister of shipping is not doing his duty, instead of being here listening to me he should be getting a coal cargo. I hope I am not too harsh on the minister, but harsh measures require hard remedies, and I am appealing to him on behalf of the people of St. John's and those represented by the twelve members who are backing me in this house. There is a certain portion of the people of the Island backing us and if we cannot do anything ourselves, we have to send out our message of warning through the reporter's box. Now listen to this from the speech from the throne:

Quite recently a company has been incorporated for the purpose of the erection of a large number of working men's homes. The company hopes that as many as thirty houses at a cost not exceeding $2,000 each will be constructed during the present year, and my ministers anticipate that application will be made by the company to the legislature for certain concessions to assist them in their philanthropic activities."

Can you get anything funnier than that for comic opera? Thirty houses are going to be built in St. John's for $2,000 each. The other day one house was purchased in the city for $60,000, and here in the speech from the throne we are told that the government are in touch with a company incorporated to relieve the workingman in St. John's

What is the state of affairs in St. John's to-day? You all can see it as well as I can. Take St. John's West near the Cross Roads; on your way entering the city cast your left eye and you will see Galagay's Range and then when you arrive in town pick up the speech from the throne and see what the government of the day is going to do, and then sit down and think it over. To take this in earnest, Sir, the part of the Speech from the Throne dealing with the housing problem I would call a hoax. What does it mean? A guarantee of $60,000 to build houses for the poor of St. John's. The Government should come in here and ask to raise a half million dollars so that the people might have decent homes. During the general election last year I was asked by two prominent gentlemen of St. John's West to go into a couple of houses, and I can say that I did not expect to see such dire poverty. I never had any idea that people lived in such hovels in St. John's West. The sight just turned me right about, and I am in a position that if the Minister of Finance came in here and asked authority to raise half million dollars to help out the poor people of St. John's we would give the matter unanimous support. If the Government do not see fit to introduce such a measure so that they can raise thirty thousand dollars in interest to relieve the poor people of St. John's they are not awake to their responsibility. Why not remodel the whole city? In other cities what do we find? The people are not allowed to live in hovels like those in which the

people of St. John's West are existing in today. To take up the Speech from the Throne and find a paragraph written by the Prime Minister of the day, representative for St. John's West, (maybe misrepresents it), telling us that a company is to be incorporated to raise $60,000 to build houses for the poor of St. John's West. Can we conceive anything more ridiculous? I am sure the Member for Bonavista did not consent to that. I have more confidence in him. I know he has more sense than to endorse a paragraph like that to be handed down in the Speech from the Throne. $60,000. What can be meant to do? The ordinary planter, why Mr. Cheeseman is handing out in supplies to the men on the West Coast practically $60,000, and we are asked by the Government through the Speech from the Throne to come in here and consider the vote of $60,000 for the erection of workingmen's homes in St. John's West. $60,000 asked for the erection of thirty houses, any one not exceeding two thousand dollars in cost, and some other concessions to help them to carry out their philanthropic effort. It is hard to bring down the house in laughter when that sentence cannot do so. Then when this matter comes up before the House I am going to ask the House to reconsider the bill. And I know that I would be backed by every man on this side of the House when I would ask that at least $500,000 be guaranteed by this Government. I may be told that the interest on this loan would come out of the general revenue of the Colony. Well I admit it, and let every one from coast to coast pay their proportion of it. I am prepared to say that the people will be satisfied to pay the interest on $1,000,000. And we will get our returns for it. We do not know what these returns will be. They will be indirect. We are not experts in that direction, but if we receive our returns by saving hundreds of lives of children that go to an early grave are we not receiving our returns for that money and the general public of the Colony will be doing a philanthropic work in relieving the poor people of St. John's West from the existing conditions as we have them at the present time. It is up to the Government to get busy and relieve the depression that is among us at the present time. Laborers of St. John's are walking the streets. Why not get them to work of this kind? These measures should be taken immediately and gone right into if the Government of the day are earnest in carrying out their obligations to the voters of the country, but it looks as if it is not in earnest, and I know there are men on the other side of the House who would today be on this side of the House if I had accepted their terms.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—I would not be on that side under any condition.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN: — Mr. Brownrigg ought to procure a book of the rules and regulations of the house and peruse them, and conduct himself in accordance with the same, and not in jumping up like a jack-in-the-box.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—The Prime Minister will please sit down and not be interfering with the authority and prestige of the first commoner of the land. Conduct yourself, sir, and do not be rising up here and showing your impertinence for which you are characterized. You have quite a lot of gall. How dare you dictate to the chair and tell me I am out of order. You can take all the applause you can get. I never play to the galleries.

Mr. Speaker, I was going on to say when the hour was called for recess that some of the gentlemen on the other side of the House would be sitting on the Opposition benches on this side of the House if they had their own way. I referred to the Minister of Finance and Customs as being a victim of circumstances. It is no secret. I give it to the public for what it is worth, because some of my friends assured me the allegiance of the Hon. Minister of Finance if I would promise him the job he now holds. I met him and he said he was prepared to come to the country with my party and support my policy with my party if I would pledge myself to give him the position he now holds. I simply told him that I was not prepared to make any promises. So much for the sincerity of the hon. gentleman on the other side of the House.

I was one of the rank and file when the Hon. Prime Minister was defeated as a member for Trinity Bay District and he sat in the Executive with me under Sir E. P. Morris in 1908. He was defeated in 1913 and came back and that gentleman, the reformer of to-day, was taken by the hand and placed in the Upper Chamber, and until the summer of 1917 was a member of the Executive Government with the office of Minister of Justice, later becoming Colonial Secretary under the National Government which he retained until the formation of the Lloyd Administration in 1918. What I want to impress on the House to-night is that I was only a member of that amalgamation since 1917. Previous to that time some of the gentlemen on the other side of the House to-night were members of the original Government. But the amalgamation was done for a purpose. The argument was that opposition and government should unite and eliminate all difference of opinion, that the welfare of the Empire was at stake and that the best possible should be done to uphold the honor and patriotic principles of the colony. We had confidence in Sir Edward Morris and we realized that what he was saying was correct. We came together and worked side by side right down until the finish of the war. We did everything possible, tackling propositions day after day and month after month until we finally won out.

Throughout all that amalgamated period and up to the time Sir Edward Morris left Newfoundland we have had many changes, but I want to impress upon the House to-night that this same Prime Minister to-night was a Member of the Executive Government all down through those years. After he was defeated in Trinity in 1913 he was put in the Upper House as Minister of Justice and he was denounced by his then opponents who are now his colleagues, that it was not constitutional that he should be allowed to retain his seat in the Upper House. We retained him as Minister of Justice until Sir Edward Morris bargained with the Opposition Party. Then Sir William Lloyd claimed the Minister of Justice post and the Colonial Secretaryship went to the present Prime Minister. Now I want to draw your attention to-night to the statements and charges made in the press within the past twelve months by this individual against Crosbie, Cashin, Bennett, Higgins and others, charges not from an opponent, not from a sincere man who is prepared to come before the Colony for a clean purpose. This man ratted from us after eight or ten years and that is one of the principal reasons why he is not sincere. He ratted from us when

Morris left and Sir William Lloyd was called upon to form a ministry. The hon. gentleman who is seeking to be Prime Minister and thinks he is, had he been straight would have met with more success and accomplished more than he has. After Morris's retirement I remember the day the present Prime Minister called at my house and asked my support to place him in the position that he is in to-day. My answer was, and I fear no contradiction: "Squires you played me false and dirty and I am not prepared to support you."

He took his hat and flew from my house. Since then he saw fit to come before the people of this Colony for the position of Prime Minister. I submit and bow to their judgment. When that gentleman was Minister of Justice and Colonial Secretary he was intimately acquainted with the affairs of the Finance Department, why did he not paint me as black then as he did within the past six months? If he saw anything wrong in connection with my Department then why did he not report me to the Prime Minister of the day that I was playing wrong and that I was dishonest and crooked? As Minister of Justice he stabbed me in the back and I was not prepared to support a man of that calibre. He owns and controls **The Daily Star** paper, which has held me up to the country during the past six months by its base, low and contemptible utterances. If I was the crook that he represented me to be, why did he not report me to the Government long ago. I know that he tries to take advantage of a forgetful people and spring it upon them that he is something new in politics. The reason I am making these statements to-night is that I owe it to myself and to the people of Ferryland District who have implicit confidence in me. I fear no enquiry into my record as a public man. Charges have also been made against other members on this side. Keep on, and if you can find anything I am prepared to take my medicine, but I will take nothing lying down from anyone in this House or outside of it.

Again after the amalgamated party was formed we took particular care to safeguard the soldiers and sailors who were fighting our battles overseas. We were never found wanting when just claims were to be paid them. And now, while we were in charge and the present Prime Minister was associated with us, a claim for 3 or 4 hundred thousand dollars due the Reid Company, on account of branch railroads, came before us. These railroads were started ten years ago. The hon. leader of the F.P.U. was a member of that Government. A committee was appointed and certain correspondence was exchanged between the contractor and the Government.

The Governor knows the whole story, but there is nothing on record. I put it to you, Mr. Speaker, do you think it is fair? Now, we don't want you to come back in your papers tomorrow and villify us for making this statement. It will be interesting to hear you both give a satisfactory explanation of how this came to be. I don't want to hang on to this matter all night. I have other matters of sufficient importance to warrant my attention, but I just want to jog your memory. It is not on record but it is my duty, being the oldest politician in this House to-night. I have committed many sins during the past 28 years of my public life and I am now carrying the political sins of my party upon my shoulders.

Just one or two other items I want to refer to, Mr. Speaker, before I take my seat. To-day I have dealt with the coal situation, the food situation, and the fishery, but there's one or two other minor incidents in connection with the promises made by the Government of the present day that I see no

mention of in the Speech from the Throne.

Now what move, Mr. Speaker, has been made in the question of accommodation. The hospitals to-day are overcrowded. The asylums are overcrowded. People are living in boarding houses when they should be in hospital receiving medical treatment. We made a move in this direction about 18 months ago and built a sanitarium. Twelve months ago our attention was called to the condition of the asylum for the insane. I went in there and I saw that the report sent in was not a bit exaggerated. I came out and acquainted my colleagues of the terrible conditions under which the inmates of that institution were existing, 4 and 5 persons living in one room with dimensions of probably eight feet by twelve. It is a crying shame to have those poor unfortunates who were afflicted by God living under such conditions. Inside of 48 hours we got busy and ordered that an addition be built to the institution to accommodate 100 persons.

If I was able to-night to get back to review the many things we have to our credit during our term of office it would take me a long time. Now, gentlemen, take a car and go into the asylum. I will put one or two cars at your disposal, and have a look at it. I ask you one and all to take a look at that institution and when you come back I want you to implore your Government to put it back on a sound decent basis. The Poor House is just the same. The inmates there are tumbling over themselves ilke so many sardines in a tin. You will pull them out and use their votes and put them back again. How many poor miserable remnants of humanity up there at the present time that you have not visited except when you wanted their votes?

Thre are many other things, gentlemen that I want to draw your attention to-night. I would like to know what is being done about the Commercial Cable Company to recover that $200,000 they still owe the Colony. We brought a case against them in the Supreme Court here and we won, they appealed and we won it, and now they have sent their case to the Privy Council in England. Now what are you doing about that. I should think there is upwards of $250,000 now due us from the Commercial Cable Co. If we lose that case we lose the $250,000 and we lose also the taxes in the future. The Anglo-American Co. refused to pay their taxes, but when proceedings were taken against the Commercial Co. the Anglo came across with the goods and paid $97,000. Now if we lose that case there are ten chances to one that we will also have to pay back to the Anglo that $97,000. In the meantime we are spending money in bringing down auditors and lying down to the fact that the best lawyer in the country is at the present time needed in England to fight our case against the Commercial Cable Co. You will not have done justice to the Colony or to the people of this Colony if you don't move in the matter.

I think I have fairly well reviewed the Speech from the Throne and have come to the same conclusion as my colleagues, that it is the baldest document of its sort ever handed down in this House. Not one section of it is worthy of the Government of the day. There is nothing here about railroads. The clause with reference to housing the poor is nothing else but a burlesque. This is another of the promises made by the Prime Minister and his colleague in St. John's West in the bye-election. It does not give a guarantee that the Government are going to pay the interest on the money. It is the duty of the Government to take hold of this matter and guarantee the interest on a loan of say a million dollars. In this city from one end of it to

the other there are families of five, six and seven existing in one room and what are you going to do about it. In what other part of the Island is this thing going on to-night I ask? Here in the capital city we have a shocking condition of affairs in the direction mentioned although we are surrounded by many people who are interested in the advancement of humanity. Tomorrow if an epidemic breaks out how much money will be spent on it. Why are you not big enough to go and get a loan of this money to build proper houses for the poor to live in. Hundreds of men are going around the city idle and they will be leaving here altogether to look for employment if things go on as they are much longer. Why not get a loan of a half million dollars, which at five per cent would only mean an interest of $25,000 a year. We are very sorry also that there is nothing foreshadowed in the Speech from the Throne to deal with the high cost of living.

Before taking my seat I move the following amendment that the following words be added to the Address in Reply:

"We are sorry in view of the conditions prevailing throughout the country as regards the high cost of living that His Excellency's speech foreshadowed no action on the part of the Government with reference to the prices of the necessaries of life."

MR. SINNOTT:—I beg leave to second the amendment.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The hon. member for Placentia has spoken and he cannot speak a second time.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Speaker, I rise to say that the hon. member for Placentia is in order. Every member who has taken part in the debate spoke on the original motion and can now speak on the amendment. I will refer you to May's Parliamentary Practice.

For my first reference look at page 320 Mays Parliamentary Practice, 11th edition. For my other point see page 296. (Reads.) Mr. Speaker, you may look in your book while I am looking in mine. Any member may speak to the same question or to the amendment provided it is being proposed by a member other than himself. It is a very definite pronouncement and I want to put it on record. A member may speak to a new question. A member who has spoken on the original question may speak to the amendment. He can propose the amendment before he has taken his seat. A man who has spoken on the original question cannot get up and move an amendment as he has forfeited his right of speaking again. In this particular case the Leader of the Opposition has introduced a new question and he has made an amendment to that and so every member in the House can speak to the amendment. No one can move an amendment having already spoken. I have a recollection on that point is laid down clearer in Bourmot. I shall submit it to my learned friend.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Speaker, in reference to the quotations made by my learned friend, the member for St. John's East, I would like to make some quotation in support of my point of order and in opposition to his. In the first place I quite agree that the hon. member for Placentia and St. Mary's may speak to an amendment before the House although he had spoken to the original question. But the amendment must be before the House. Now an amendment is not before the House until it has been moved and seconded. I may refer my learned friend to rules 74 and 76. Now then a member who has already spoken cannot move another amendment which is the meaning of the quotation given by the other side of the House. A member who has already spoken to the original question

has no right to rise again to propose an amendment or an adjournment of the House or of debate, though he can rise to speak to new questions made by other members. As I said before the moving of a motion does not bring it before the House and any man who has already spoken cannot speak again.

MR. HIGGINS:—What about the accepted principle that the mover and seconder are not parties to the question?

Mr. Speaker ruled that the amendment not being seconded was not before the chair.

HON. THE MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—Mr. Speaker, I hope that I will not take up too much of the time of the House in dealing with the few matters to which I wish to refer. During the past few days, references have been made to matters concerning my Department, and I now wish to inform the House as to the true positions with regard to these.

First of all, Sir, however, I wish to offer my hearty congratulations to you upon the honour that has been done you by your election to the high position you now occupy, and I trust, Sir, that during our four years stay here you will always show that fairness which your decisions thus far show you possess. I also wish to congratulate the Mover and Seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I feel sure that the whole country when they read their able addresses will fully approve of the force of their remarks, and I am confident that in future years when other members are tired of performing this duty, that we shall be able to call on them again.

My Hon. Friend Sir Michael Cashin in speaking upon the subject of the address this afternoon, mentioned matters personal in relation to cargoes of fish that I have shipped to foreign markets. He stated that it was reported that I wanted to sell my own cargoes and used my position and influence to forward the Trading Company's interests. In reply, I state that from a period just previous to the time the Fish Regulations came in force up to the present day, I shipped seven cargoes of fish across, and so far I have only been paid the full value of two of them. Out of 200,000 quintals of fish sold in Portugal since the Regulations, I sold one cargo. In the light of these facts you can see that I have not used my position as Minister of Marine and Fisheries to benefit myself or the Trading Company, as we are in no better position as regards sales than many other shippers, although our reputation for fish of good quality is generally recognized.

Another remark made tonight by my Hon. Friend, the Leader of the Opposition, was in connection with the Circulars sent to our Councils in 1918. I often wonder when I read those Circulars how I came to write them so well and gauged the situation so accurately.

At the time the Conscription Act was being drafted, the whole country was on fire over Conscription. We all knew that three-fourths of the country did not want Conscription, and I knew that I had to cast in my lot with the Government and ensure the passing of the Act, thus risking the work of my life and my public career. I knew what I would have to face, especially from my opponents; I knew that many of my supporters objected, but I ventured all on the principle of **"Empire first."**

That Circular was written at my desk in this House immediately after the passing of the Conscription Act in this House. It was hastily written, but upon its face it bears the imprint of sincerity and determination to overcome and endure. That Bill went up to the Upper House where it was

considerably amended. That Circular can be read and re-read in the House for the next fifty years by friend or foe, but never will it reflect upon the man who wrote it.

Another matter that has come up for much discussion by the members of the House in commenting on the Speech from the Throne is the matter of the Fish Regulations. Now I want to say a few words in explanation of these Regulations. During October 1918, great annoyance was caused fish exporters in this country by the establishment in Italy of a body or fish dealers who banded together with the intention of handling all imports of fish to that country. This combine was known as the Consorzio. The Government here protested against its formation or construction, but nothing was done to eliminate the trust. I went to Italy in the winter of 1919 and interviewed the Italian Government and the President of the Consorzio. I asked them to abolish the Consorzio, as it was unfair to an ally and detrimental to the commercial interests of a British Colony, and we didn't want to do wrong towards them in asking unjust prices for our fish; but my efforts were fruitless. This Consorzio last spring refused to allow Newfoundland fish to enter Italy, and ordered several of our vessels, loaded with fish, out of Italian ports, which were then sent to Mr. Hawes, Alicante.

Conditions were the same all the summer, and things began to look serious as the time for the buying of fish arrived.

The ex-Minister of Shipping and the trade kept up the fight with them continuously, and after four months' fight they gave in and agreed to buy on terms submitted by the trade. They then bought 18,000 or 20,000 quintals from Mr. Hawes at 95/- cash against documents. Just at the time when everything seemed to be going well, in steps Mr. Munn, offering two or three cargoes at a reduction of 10/- per quintal. Mr. Munn did not know what Mr. Hawes sold that fish at, and made offers without knowing the exact conditions.

Here was a case of an irresponsible destroying the 4 months' work of the trade and Government in fighting the Italian Combine in the interests of a square deal for Newfoundland. Had Mr. Earle or Mr. Munn known the exact conditions, probably they would have stood out for the price obtained by Mr. Hawes. They rushed in where angels feared to tread and destroyed the fabric built up after months of contest, and the Consorzio triumphed. If Mr. Munn cut prices in one day ten shillings, what was there to prevent someone else from cutting the price another five shillings the next day or next week? The Consorzio, finding Newfoundland dealers, all to pieces, one working against the other, endeavoured to use one against the other, and finding all with cold feet they thought they could buy at their own prices. A big slump in Italy meant a big slump in all markets, for all eyes were then turned towards Italy. I will refer later to Mr. Earle's statement of profits at 85 shillings.

At this time the old Government were defeated in Newfoundland and we came into power. The trade immediately placed the situation before me, and I saw how useless it would be to revert to the old tactics of my Hon. Friend, the ex-Minister of Shipping, who tried to work by persuasion, but failed; and I resolved to take action, under the Import and Export Act, and fix the prices of fish in all markets by law. This was the beginning of fish regulations.

I was then informed that a firm in Spain had sent Circular Letters out to the Spanish fish dealers offering fish at 78/- that was then selling at about 90/- to 95/-. So Spain was then

brought into the scope of Regulations to prevent a big slump there. Portugal was then in a desperate condition, and some had cold feet and were offering fish at any price or rushing it into the hands of consignees to be sold at a sacrifice. We held those at bay and fixed a price that only entitled the shippers to come out without loss. Confidence was restored, and I am more resolved than ever that the Regulations are to be maintained, and I consider the results fully justified the action.

Mr. Hawes was recommended as a suitable man to handle the Italian situation; he was experienced in the European markets, was an able, shrewd man, highly capable for the work, and I agreed that he should be given the necessary power to deal with Italy. He accomplished a great work for us in Italy soon after his arrival there, and backed by all the authority we could secure for him, he succeeded in making a binding contract with the Consorzio. That contract saved the country from disaster, as its effect was felt in all the markets. When he made the contract 53 Italian liras were equivalent to a pound, only a week or two later Italian exchange went bad, and had we not a contract, the price must have declined 10/- per quintal in a few days. The Italians purchased at 85/- with exchange at 53, it soon went to 63 and on to 83. The fish they bought at 85/- soon cost them, through low exchange, 130/-. You will perceive what this means to the poor Italians, and what conditions prevail there. Had Mr. Hawes not contracted when he did, our fish could not have sold in Italy two weeks after at more than 70/-.

The exchange situation is overlooked by those who find fault with the Regulations. The big injurious factor in Portugal and Italy is the alarming low rate of exchange. In Portugal, 80/- to us means 240/- to the Portuguese buyers, as our dollar is worth three of their money. Fancy Portugal taking over half a million quintals of our fish—the largest buyers in the world—and paying 240/- of their money for a quintal of fish.

We sold 150,000 qtls. by that Hawes agreement, but we have not been able to find the necessary fish suitable for the Italian requirements, and we could have disposed of 50,000 qtls. more if we could have produced the right quality of fish. It was not to be had. The bank fish on the West Coast was not suitable. The Italian market requires small, hard cured, merchantable fish—something like the Brazil requirements, except Italian must be smooth and not salty, while Brazil takes rough and salty. This is a lesson to us respecting improved cure and the proper assortment of fish for the several markets, which I will refer to later.

One of the best things I think I ever did was by going to Europe this past winter, because I became acquainted with conditions exactly as they existed, and am now in the position to adjust any contingency that may arise, and that I think would be suitable and for the betterment of the Trade of this Dominion.

The position that I occupy in this Government is an important and a strong one. When I propose regulaery and the Government is not prepared to accept, then I will walk out of the Government. I am not going to propose anything that will be detrimental to the people of the country or the Trade thereof; nor am I going to allow anyone to dictate to me as to what my duties are; and when I made up my mind to make regulations governing the price of fish, I intended sincerely to put them through as long as I believed they benefitted the people of the country. I assure you again, Mr. Speaker, that I will never

put any regulations in force or be the means of promoting or recommending any regulation that will in any way be injurious to the Trade or to the fishermen, whom I represent. And let me say, that earnest and energetic as I appear to be, my chief interest is in the men who sent me to this House.

If I can see a certain fixed price paid for fish in the foreign markets, I will know pretty well what should be paid for fish locally. The exporters here have not been alive to their trade responsibilities in marketing fish for years past; fish shipping has been a gamble, pure and simple. An exporter may be a millionaire one year and in poverty the next. We want to protect ourselves against the past methods. I have been thinking this matter over for many years; I have listened to men interested in this subject during the past ten years; I have attended meetings of fish shippers where they fixed the price on fish one day and the very next offered fish at a less price. My Honourable friend, Sir John Crosbie knows that he tried in 1918 and 1919 to arrange prices and adjust conditions in order that we might get the best possible price for our products. Meetings were held day after day and night after night, and after arranging matters one day, a man who sat on that very committee would on the next day be the first to break the arrangement. I have an experience that my connection with the Shipping and Fishery Departments afforded, and that experience has taught me that I should do something never attempted before to place the business of exporting fish on a sound basis that would reduce considerably the risks so generally shouldered under the old system of shipping on consignments.

If Sir John Crosbie were in my place and his Party in Office, he probably would be enforcing similar regulations, based on the experience of past years.

If we had allowed the combine in Italy to fix the price on our Newfoundland fish, how could we hope to handle the situation that confronted us? Could we expect Mr. Hawes to sell at 95/- per quintal while another man without hesitation would have sold at 85/-, and yet another with banks running after him for advances selling at 80/-. No one would buy fish unless convinced that prices were down to rock bottom. Who then would be anxious to buy if prices were cut 10/- in one day? Such buyers would hold off and wait until the irresponsibles had tired of cutting under each other.

I sold fish in Greece this year for 103/- and within a week, a man in this country offered fish at 80/-. Now why sell at 80/- when 103/- was obtainable? The market was gradually dropping until it declined to 79/-, when we stepped into the breach and said that the price for Greece must be 95/- and we sold as much fish in Greece this year at the regulation price as we did last year and received cash against documents. With regard to Greece for next year, we are going to put a Trade Commissioner there and we will have a man from Newfoundland to look after our interests. The consumption in Greece during the past five years has increased 100 per cent. or from 50,000 qtls. to 100,000 qtls. How can we expect buyers in Greece to purchase outright if one buyer pays 103/- one week and find his competitor buying the following week at80/-. If the buyers knew that all would have to purchase at a fixed maintained price, they would willingly buy, knowing that they could not be undersold and profits instead of losses would result.

I do not need to labor this point, as all interested can easily perceive what benefit must ensue to buyer and seller by such an arrangement. Arrangement by consent failed utterly and we had to take the bull by the horns and fix a price by law. The

cure was drastic, but it was absolutely necessary, and in my opinion the results have fully justified the steps taken. There can be no looking back —onward and forward must be our watchword. There need be no cold feet—reasonable values will be forthcoming the coming season, and under our Regulations all will fare alike.

A standard article must be produced and every cargo must bear the stamp of quality that will ensure our fish a market equally as favourable as any competitor. I am a believer in outright sales, and if that system is to work satisfactorily we must supply a quality of fish that will prove a credit to the Colony.

We expected at the time of the elections that fish would go down to $5 or $6 per quintal. We all looked towards Italy. We had one hundred and fifty thousand quintals of Shore and one hundred and fifty thousand quintals of Labrador soft that should be sold in Italy. Spain, Portugal and Brazil knew that Italy was not buying, and they would not buy either; they held off hoping the price would decline and fish would be had at their own price. That was the position. Everyone locally were buying some fish, and our biggest buyers were buying as little as possible. I was nervous all last fall, and I daresay the Honourable the then Prime Minister was too. All here knew of the serious Italian situation, and all shuddered with the thought of what would happen if Italy held off. I asked the Government to convene a conference of the Trade to consider the situation, but to no avail. All realized that if Italy held off every market would follow suit. Already three months' consumption had been lost in Italy. That in itself meant the loss of sales amounting to 100,000 quintals. With this situation confronting us, there was no other course open but that adopted by selecting our best man to handle the Italian situation. That course saved the country from a calamity and has placed at least one million four hundred thousand dollars in the pockets of the exporters to date.

There was a statement made in the Upper House a few days ago that we lost three million dollars on fish this year, through the operation of the Regulations. I defy that man to prove that even one penny was lost on fish this year through the Regulations. I throw out the challenge to him; his statement was unfounded and untrue. He knew it to be such when he uttered it. Men who represent Water Street and who make such statements without facts to substantiate them, are a menace to the best interests of the country and are unfit to be in the Upper House. In my younger days in this House, I might have said some silly things in the course of a speech, but you never yet heard me say anything of a serious nature without proofs.

Do you know that when we undertook the work of the Regulations, fish was quoted at 96|— in Brazil. For weeks before we came into power, Brazil prices held at 96|—, and no sales were being made. The Brazilian buyers held off. They thought fish was going to be cheaper. They had their agents here in the persons of Messrs. Walter Monroe and Charles Duder, and everything that was done here in the fish business was soon known in Brazil. Now, do you know that this time last year there was, in the city of St. John's, one hundred and ten thousand quintals of Brazilian fish and to-day there is not forty thousand. Almost all this forty thousand has been sold at about 110|—. Last year this time that market was overstocked with old fish, and remained so up to the end of

September. This year Brazil will not hold a drum of old fish after October, and when the new fish comes in during September, Brazil will be paying at least 110|— for its supplies. A big contrast with last October, when no sales could be made even at 96|—.

In the past Brazilian firms used to say "send us your fish and we will pay you by a ninety days draft payable about six months after the receipt of the fish." In other words, it frequently happened that six months elapsed before the shipper of the fish received his money in London. This year, 90 per cent is paid before the fish leaves port, and out of 200,000 qtls. shipped so far this season not a penny's loss for claims has been made, and most all the shippers have received cash in full.

In future there is to be an inspection on fish for Brazil and nobody is going to get around it. I am surprised that the merchants of this country did not inaugurate this policy of inspection and payment twenty years ago. If they had, one firm would not have lost two hundred thousand dollars the year past on three cargoes of fish shipped to Brazil. On each drum of fish shipped to Brazil we have given the shipper two dollars through the regulations that I feel sure would not be theirs had there been no regulations.

We sold in Greece since the Regulations were enforced fifty thousand quintals of fish and at ten shillings more than we would have got if we did not try and keep shippers of fish protected.

Portugal to date has taken sixty seven thousand quintals of fish more this year than last year. Since July 1st, Portugal has taken four hundred and seventy thousand quintals of fish, whereas for the previous twelve months only four hundred and seven thousand qtls. were shipped there. Only forty thousand quintals of Oporto fish remain in Newfoundland to-day, and Portugal consumes on the average forty thousand quintals of fish per month. There are about sixty thousand quintals in Portugal and forty here, and there will be no new fish to any extent till September, when they will be able to get the usual supply. We were told of a man who sold a cargo at seventy-six shillings and defied the regulations; I could have sold that cargo through our Trade Commissioner at 81/- cash. There have been eleven cargoes sold there outright at 81/-; those bought at our price. The man who sold for 76/- broke the regulations and lost a dollar per quintal. I am doing my best for the country's welfare, and here is an exporter underselling, injuring himself and making it impossible to sell at 81/-. Who expects Oporto or Lisbon to buy outright at 81/- if, during the next day or week, someone buys at five shillings less. We cannot do sound business on such a basis. The Portuguese situation is at present fairly satisfactory—yesterday one of our shippers was instructed to draw at the rate of 60/- per quintal on an Oporto cargo. This is an indication of outright selling. We cannot sell outright and consign at the same time if we want satisfactory returns. No buyers will be anxious to buy outright at 80/- if another from the same city received consignments which may be sold five shillings less and cause a loss to the outright buyers. Outright sales are what we must insist on; it is the only basis for sound business. We must regulate prices for outright selling; cash to be paid here and standard quality certificates attached to each Bill of Lading.

If the Trade will stand behind me, I will strive to get the best price possible for our fish, but if the Trade are not satisfied to that, then they had

better get someone to take Coaker's place, and let fishery matters run on as in the past. I do not want to be in the Fishery Department. My place is down at Port Union looking after the fishermen's interests. I do not want more work, or more salary as a Minister, but seeing that I could do something to help along the trade and thereby help the fishermen of the country, I decided to accept the position as Minister of Marine & Fisheries. If the trade will not stand behind me, it must accept the responsibility which the country will place upon its shoulders for being too selfish and unpatriotic to avail of the first opportunity in a half century of adjusting business conditions that every business man with experience has condemmed continually from year to year.

My service can be availed of now, I am here to perform and not to talk or play. If the trade says no; we are content; then, I am ready to bid adieu to the Fishery Department, and it can proceed in the future as in the past—an eyesore and a reflection upon the people and country.

I can sell our fish as well as they can; Port Union fish has a reputation and will sell as favourable as any other fish either at St. John's or outports. The regulations are nothing to me but hard work and worry. We may hear in a few days that Mr. Hawes is disgruntled because he cannot get his own way or that I refuse to accept his advice. Mr. Hawes' ideas may sometimes clash with mine.

Before I got to Portugal there had been a meeting of fish dealers there, and they had passed resolutions embodying their dissent to buying any Newfoundland fish under the regulations.

I had a letter from one of the strongest firms in Oporto offering to buy all fish going to Oporto and pay cash in Newfoundland for it at the regulation prices. They said there is the proposition, and if you will not send fish to Oporto through anybody else and you will live up to the Regulations and sell the fish according to the regulations, we will buy. We will pay cash for it in St. John's before it sails, because you will give us certificate of the cargo and you have agents here to adjust all claims. You cannot send fish to Oporto on consignment and sell outright as well. There will be no more consignments. When sent there on consignment it may lay in store and rot or go dunn. On one occasion when I got my returns from Oporto only 45/- was got for the fish I sent, when I was offered 95/- before it left Nfld. Therefore, it is a poor policy to send fish on consignment to foreign fish dealers. The houses in which it is stored are not weather tight; the windows are low down and the glasses out and the rain beats in and often spoils the fish. There is a half inch of dirt on the floor and the germs ruin the fish. That is the position of sending fish on consignment to some Oporto dealers.

I know people on the West Coast who sold, contrary to the regulations, two hundred and fifty thousand dollars worth of fish to a firm which was bankrupt a year ago. The firm was not worth 25,000 dollars. Shippers should know to whom they were ship sent this fish on consignment on sent over the fish on consignment on the authority of someone in London. If one asked such shippers for a loan of $10,000 they would want to know what it was wanted for and what security could he given. They had no one on the other side to check and see if they got 75/- or 90/- for their fish. They would get an account of sales or something, and there it ended, gain or lose. Men here in the fish business who strive on Water Street to make money, work late at night and watch every cent they spend, make mistakes

in this way and waste all they have earned in the twinkling of an eye. I know of a person who had 10,000 qtls. of fish in Portugal and the sale of it looked very doubtful, and the party asked us to help him out. We got cash down for it on condition that no further shipments are sent to that port for a certain time. This is where regulations prove good, and but for the regulations that lot of 10,000 qtls. may lay in store on consignment until it became black with dunn and sold at half its value.

If members of this Legislature say that the regulations are no good, they are saying what is unfounded. I know my friends on the other side of the House are led away by party politics. But when this matter comes up before the House in the shape of a Bill, I hope they will all stand by my efforts to place our staple industry on a sound business basis. So far, the regulations have benefited the country to an astounding degree. They prevented prices from going to pieces, and at same time secured some profits. 160,000 drums have been sold under regulations to Brazil at a profit of 2.00 per drum over what would have been paid without regulations. That means $320,000. Portugal has taken 200,000 qtls. of which 130,000 qtls have been sold at a price that has given exporters $2.00 per qtl. which means another $260,000. We sold Spain 200,000 qtls. since regulations came into operation, and at a saving of $2.00 per qtl., another $400,000 has been conferred by regulations.

Italy has purchased 170,000 qtls. since the regulations became operative and at a saving of only $2.00 per qtl. another $340,000 has been added to the amount plucked from the threatening disaster. Greece has purchased 50,000 qtls. since Nov. 20th, and at $2.00, another $100,000 has been credited to the regulations. A total of $1,420,000. To this may be added sales of stocks abroad and locally, that will make the protection afforded equal to a sum of $1,750,000 saved to the exporters of Newfoundland that most of them expected would be lost when they reflected on the 10th day of November last.

Mr. Long complains that he was prevented from selling a cargo by one of the Advisory Board because he could not sell at 84/-, less 1%, while 84/-, less 2%, was offered. The Board is not responsible for that trouble, as it was not consulted; but Mr. Long's cargo got in trouble after leaving Fogo and the ship had to make for St. John's, discharge and repair, and under those circumstances had he closed for that cargo at 84/- less 1%, the buyers would have cancelled the sale when they found that the cargo would probably arrive in April instead of December. He would never have got an offer of 84 shillings for that fish but for the regulations. The price would have gone down to 80 or 70 shillings in two weeks, and later still lower down But the regulations would not permit the decline in accordance with the desire of the fish dealers in Oporto, and the 81 shillings price fixed in February has been maintained up to the present, except in the case of Mr. Long's cargo, recently sold through Rolfe & Co. for 76/-.

If the fish that was sent to Oporto was standardized there would not be half the stocks there that we find today. When I went to the stores in Oporto I found that the No. 1 fish had been all grabbed up. If there had been three times as much No. 1 fish it would have been all sold promptly. The people want No. 1 fish; they want good fish, and we have to see to it that we send them good fish. These people don't want mixed fish. They want No. 1, and if we give them No. 1 and protect them,

we will have in Portugal our best market. It is the best market we have in the world. We have to see to it that our fish is properly cured, and that it is properly assorted. We send to Spain very little prime Spanish quality. The Spaniard wants a different kind of fish from other markets. He has no use for white fish; won't buy it. He wants thick, yellow fish, which he eats raw. He doesn't want it salty, but almost smatchy and not hard. They have a national meal of rice and curry, and it tastes very much like smatchy fish. They don't want hard fish; they want a soft fish. Then we are told that fish is selling in Spain for 60 shillings. Such fish went there before the regulations came into force, and we do not accept any responsibility for the low price it may be sold at. That fish would be dunn, or turning red, slimy or sunburnt. Give us a chance to see what the regulations can accomplish after a full years' operation. Let us start with the new fish this season and after a few months all will recognize the benefit of regulations and control of exports. We started last year at a time when half the catch had been shipped, and our greatest difficulty was caused by having so much fish in the markets on consignment not under control. The uncontrolled fish controlled the price of the new arrivals. If we fixed 85/- as a price in Portugal or Spain, it was not possible to secure such unless through outright sales, as consigned fish sent before Nov. 20th flooded the markets and competed with the new arrivals. Hence no fair trial of the regulations was possible; but starting the new season and carrying it through, we will have a fair trial of its merits and will then be able to judge properly as to its benefits.

We want fish standardized, inspected in St. John's, and paid for in St. John's. Can we have any better system? 170,000 quintals of fish has been sent to Italy since the date of the regulations. Two-thirds of this fish would have sold below 70/- had there been no regulations and sale through Mr. Hawes. Exchange created a bad situation. It was so bad that the price of the fish came to 130 shillings. One week after our bargain was signed exchange went down to 63 liries in the pound, making a difference of about $1.50 per qtl. more to the Italians.

I have found that the Consorzio was comprised of a fair, business-like lot of men. They wanted to get the fish at the lowest price possible, and the wonder of it is that we have got along as well as we have. Italy was without any fish last fall when she should have consumed 100,000 quintals. In Brazil fish is now selling at 110 shillings, and the only firm that has held out against the regulations is the Seixas firm. They want to get our fish on their own terms; but they will find that while we will be fair we will also be firm. If they will not buy on our conditions, they may find some day that their big competitor at Pernambuco will receive all the shipments from here to that port and thereby control to a considerable extent the sales in that great city. If this happens, they alone will be to blame. We want to treat all right, but if any think they can play with the trade interests of this country, it might happen that more progressive men will slip into their business.

What, gentlemen, has made the big corporations of the world? What has made the Standard Oil Company and the Imperial Oil Company? Nothing but organization in disposal of their products to the different markets of the world. There must be regulations by which all will be governed; there must be unity. If we are compelled to do so by the lack of business ability on the part of foreign buyers, we will open our wholesale branches abroad and dispose of our products as has

been done by big well organized and successful concerns. We must have a man in the markets who will look after our interests. That is what we want, and it is the cause of our failure in years gone by.

Mr. Speaker last night when we adjourned this debate at midnight, it was my intention to proceed today, so I take this opportunity of finishing my remarks in connection with the Address in Reply. Some business men have asked what quantities of fish have been sold in Spain since the regulations came into effect.

Two hundred thousand quintals of fish have been sent to Spain since the regulations came into effect, and out of that amount of fish one hundred and thirty thousand quintals have been sold, leaving about seventy thousand quintals unsold. That is not a large stock for Spain at this time of the year. There is very little Spanish fish in the country today and the exports from Newfoundland to Spain will not be very large from now until the new fish is ready in September. Last year about this time twenty-eight thousand quintals of fish were ordered from Italy to Spain. Labrador fish that was sent to Italy, when the vessels got there, was not allowed to enter port, and Mr. Hawes was asked to save it by storing at Alicante. The time of the year had come when nobody wanted Labrador fish. Hawes and Company were appealed to, and they took charge of the cargoes and put them in cold storage and sold them during the summer. Instead of there being a total loss, the exporters received very fair returns. Not only was this done, but from this time up to the latter part of September some thirty thousand quintals of old Shore fish were sold in Spain. The amount of sixty thousand quintals of fish was sold in Spain during last summer. This quantity was placed in cold storage and prevented from deteriorating. That is what happened in Spain. Sixty thousand quintals of fish were sold in Spain during a season that had always been considered unsuitable for handling fish.

In former years, no one there would think of taking fish in the Spring of the year, as it would surely deteriorate, but, under the present circumstances, with the cold storage facility a fresh supply of fish can be provided weekly during the warm summer weather. Spain to-day instead of being an eight month market, has become a twelve month market. The seventy thousand quintals of fish now in Spain are not a large quantity under those circumstances. The only bad feature about this fish is that it is an inferior quality. Much of it should be in Italy or Portugal. It will have to be sold in Spain at reduced prices. When I was in Spain, I saw a lot of this fish there, utterly unsuitable for that market, and it had to be sold at a reduced price. This has nothing to do with the Regulations. The fish went there before regulations went into force. At present, Italy has no surplus of Labrador fish and Spain has only a small quantity. When some arrivals reach there the stocks will not exceed ten thousand quintals. This amount is not going to last very long. Spain up to date this year has received from us three hundred and forty six thousand quintals of fish as against two hundred and sixty three for the previous year. Therefore, Spain has taken eighty three thousand quintals of fish more this year than the previous year. Now in view of those facts, I would ask what my friends on the other side of the House who are opposed to the Regulations have to say. They say the Regulations have stifled the consumption of our fish in the foreign markets. Here is an instance when Spain has for 10 months

taken eighty three thousand quintals more than she did for the preceding year. In the preceding year the total exports were two hundred and sixty three thousand qtls. It is not surprising to find considerable quantities of fish in Spain to-day because cargoes sent from the North last fall and intended for Italy were forced into Spain owing to the Consorzio's action in refusing to purchase from Newfoundland.

At the present time we have an enquiry from Italy for old fish, and it would be a big advantage if the merchants would find out what fish they have on hand and let me know. They have arrived at some arrangement whereby an American firm can supply fish to Italy on terms financially satisfactory to the Consorzio. I would like to know just what fish we have on hand. It is my opinion, and the facts back up my opinion, that because of the fish regulations the situation in the market to-day is much more favorable than this time last year. Greece has taken 90,000 qtls. so far this year. Last year she took 86,000 altogether. The returns show much more, but the Escasoni's cargo was cleared for Greece and increase the quantity. The real quantity was 86,000 qtls. Brazil has taken 200,000 qtls. so far this year. Last year she took 260,000 qtls. up to end of April. We haven't enough to supply the Brazilian demands this season. All stocks on hand have been sold. Stocks on hand at present are 40,000 qtls. against 110,000 last year at this time. Halifax has taken 30,000 quintals of fish from the West Coast. Some have told us that we are losing sales in Brazil which Halifax was securing, but Halifax have to replenish stocks from the West Coast. I think it is a very fortunate transaction. The West Coast fish are not suited for the Brazilian market. If the fish has been sold at Halifax, it has undoubtedly been sold at a profit. If it had been sent to Brazil it would have sustained a loss. If it had gone to Oporto it would have done no good. If the people on the West Coast can't dry their fish by the sun they will have to get driers and make fish suitable for the Brazil market. No man can handle 100,000 quintals of fish without shipping some to the Brazil market, and it is no wonder that a man like Mr. Harris has had to worry over the disposal of his stocks, seeing he has not been able to ship to Brazil. Last year this time the Brazil market was over-stocked. The 110,000 quintals of old fish sold in Brazil last year from May to October, were with great difficulty disposed of. The catch of fish for the year ending December last was about 80,000 qtls. short of the preceding year. That makes it all the easier to dispose of the full catch of last year before new fish arrives. There is not in Newfoundland to-day 150,000 quintals of old fish to be disposed of, as against over 300,000 qtls. last year at this date.

Now I am going to refer to the remarks of my friend, Sir John Crosbie. He made some important remarks regarding Mr. Earle's fish. Mr. Earle has made a statement that he sent three cargoes of fish to Italy on which he made $44,000. And he further states that the Government was not satisfied but wanted him to make $66,000. I want to say right here that such a profit was impossible. The statement was made for the purpose of injuring the fish regulations. It is true that Mr. Earle purchased his fish for less than was paid in St. John's or at Port Union. At 85 shillings he couldn't make 10 cents per quintal if he paid $12.00 for fish. He did make a big profit on 6,000 quintals Labrador fish, about $3.00 a quintal; but the fish was purchased at Fogo at a low price. In St. John's or at Port Union at that time Labrador fish cost

$10.50, including labor. But is this any reason why we should allow Mr. Earle to sell $1.00 or $1.50 less than the merchants on Water Street could sell at? The fact that Mr. Earle sold at 85 shillings when Mr. Hawes sold at 95 shillings ought to be sufficient proof that he did not get the price that he should, and is sufficient justification for the regulation of prices. This case furnishes a good reason for the regulations. Mr. Earle would, if permitted to continue that game, ruin the markets for our whole catch of fish. Mr. Earle had little or no competition in buying his fish, and he did not give the fishermen the price that he should have given them; and if he had given them a fair price he would not have been able to undersell. So that the regulations will not only protect the merchant, but it will assure the fishermen a reasonable price for their fish; a standard price all around. If we permit Mr. Earle and a few others who can buy fish at a low price to go into the market and sell, every fish merchant on Water Street would be put out of business in a couple of years. Mr. Earle did not make $44,000 on the three cargoes. He may have made $25,000. But he should have paid a higher price for his fish in the first place, and had he done so he would not have been so anxious to cut the price 10 shillings per quintal. Had Mr. Earle paid $12 for Italian fish he would have to receive 85/- in order to make 10c. per quintal profit. He purchased probably at $10 to $10.50 and could undersell buyers whose fish cost $12. If such conditions continued, it is easy to foretell the end. A reduction of 10/- in Italy meant lower prices in every market and a loss of $2 per quintal on our catch means throwing away $3,200,000 on 1,600,000 quintals.

I stated last night that 11 cargoes had been sold in Portugal since early February. It is right to see that those selling fish in Portugal sell at a regulated price. If we allow a firm to sell at 76 shillings it means that the man who pays 81 shillings will suffer a loss. We have to protect our whole interest in the fish business, and to do that we must regulate the price under which all fish is sold.

Every reasonable man will therefore recognize that, as exporters would not or could not agree on a price to be secured abroad, it became the duty of a Fishermen's Government to adopt measures that would make a standard price for all compulsory. I am a firmer believer than ever in regulating prices, but such regulations must be principally enforced on this side and not in Europe. To enforce such on this side means the adoption of outright sales for all markets and cash payments at St. John's or London. Such a system entails a strict standard of inspection and assortment and we shall endeavour to provide the same as soon as the new fish begins to move.

We must try and keep our prices firm in Portugal, for these people would not have bought unless they thought that the price was going to be maintained at 81 shillings. Only a few days ago, our Trade Commissioner there sold 7,000 qtls. at 81 shillings for a firm on the West Coast, which was a remarkable transaction considering conditions, and no firm should sell in either Oporto or Lisbon under this figure. It is true that there are five cargoes at present outside Oporto, but we have not altogether 40,000 qtls. of fish for that market and you must remember that they take 40,000 qtls a month. Only this week I notice that the consumption has gone up in Oporto to 8,000 qtls. and in Lisbon to 3,300. Think

of it, Gentlemen, eleven thousand three hundred quintals of fish for one week. Why, Portugal is the best market we have. In Lisbon also, where previously we sold scarcely any fish, the consumption went up this week to 3,300 qtls. I think this is a wonderful position for a country like Portugal—it is a revelation and more especially, when we consider the frightful exchange conditions with which they have to contend. Their exchange is so low that our fish at the price they are now paying for it, costs them in their own money at the rate of 240 shillings, and that is the wholesaler, mind you, not the retailer. And still, sir, we have these enormous sales. Why, it is my opinion that if we were rich enough we should send them half a dozen cargoes of fish for nothing as a sort of bonus for all that they have bought and are still buying from us.

And now a word with regard to the demand to have the Regulations removed. I have here a message received from our Trade Commissioner in Spain and Portugal which reads:

> "Ridley's action has depressed the market, the Regulations can alone save the situation and they can and must be maintained."

What he means by that is that Ridley is offering fish for 75 and 76 shillings in Lisbon and the effect of this sort of thing is to create a condition so alarming that the Trade Commissioner, whose warning should be seriously considered, in looking after the country's interests, wires me that the Regulations must be maintained in force at all costs. Now I am not going to say very much more about the Regulations, but, a word as to the future. So far as I am concerned the Regulations must stand, but they will stand in accordance with these resolutions:

(a) That the Newfoundland Board of Trade recognize that Fish Export Regulations are essential; but those now in force do not entirely meet the requirements of the Trade of this Colony.

(b) It is the opinion of the Newfoundland Board of Trade that the Advisory Board should, if at any time it is essential that prices are to be adjusted, and supplies regulated, meet the whole body of the St. John's Fish Exporters, and as many Outport shippers as possible, and fully discuss the matter, and recommend to the Government the necessary alterations.

(c) That the Newfoundland Board of Trade is of the opinion that the Shippers should have the right of offering their supplies of codfish direct to the buyers in all Markets, excepting Italy at present, and in Italy as soon as conditions will permit provided they maintain the prices and regulations set forth.

(d) That the Newfoundland Board of Trade write the Government requesting them to grant the desires and wishes of the Trade.

When we bring in those regulations they will be so framed as to meet the recommendations set out here and we shall take into consideration the views and best interests of both city and outport exporters while at the same time we shall give first attention to the best interests of the country and our chief industry, whenever we find it necessary to regulate prices in the foreign markets.

Now, for the resolutions introduced by the Hon. Mr. Grieve, which were entirely in the opposite direction. His resolution was as follows:

"RESOLVED—That in the opinion

of this meeting the action of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is in the nature of a restraint of trade and is consequently illegal in law, and that the act under which sale of fish is to be regulated in the matter of prices violates a fundamental principle of political economy in so far that arbitrary prices are sought to be established without reference to the inexorable laws of supply and demand, and furthermore that the Act under which this action is taken was in the opinion of this meeting meant to prevent trading with enemy nations rather than as a bar to commercial intercourse between friendly nations."

You will see, Mr. Speaker, that this is an entirely different matter altogether and the difference between these two sets of resolutions was proven by the fact that the former were unanimously adopted by the Board of Trade irrespective of whether the members were supporters of the regulations as they then stood or not.

It is important to note that the business people of the outports are becoming interested in what the Government are doing in this direction. Some time ago we had occasion to write Messrs. G. & A. Buffett of Grand Bank about a report that came us that they had sent away a cargo of fish contrary to the regulations, and we received a letter from them in which they say they believe in standardizing exports of fish. Here is what they say:

(Copy)

Grand Bank, Nfld.,
April 21st, 1920.

W. F. Coaker, Esq.,
Minister of Marine & Fisheries,
St. John's.

Dear Sir:—We have your favor of April 9th. We note that the Government intend to control the export of fish and to standardize it, and while we do not see eye to eye with the Government in what they have done, we certainly realize the necessity of standardizing fish, and having regulations so that it will be practically impossible for any one to ship a cargo of fish to a market which demands a good article, unless the fish is of good quality.

For years past we have been in accord with your suggestions about standardizing fish, and we believe if this can be done and the culling of fish arranged on a just basis, fair alike to the fisherman and the exporter, a great deal will be done to stabilize the prices, and make conditions more satisfactory for all who are engaged in the fishery and in the fishing business.

We beg to endorse all that your Government does along the e lines and hope that the cure, ull and standardization will be a great success.

About the Grand Bank firms being represented at St. John's. As far as we can understand we were not consulted or even advised as to what was likely to happen, with the possible exception of Mr. Harris.

Yours truly,

G. & A. BUFFETT.

I believe that the sentiments expressed in that letter constitute the keynote of the feeling of the outport exporter with regard to the Fish Regulations.

I have a word to say before concluding on the subject of the cure of our fish. We have before the House a Bill providing for standardization. This Bill provides for the appointment of a committee of eleven persons, of whom one will be the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, ex-officio, while other members will be from the Board of Trade, outport fishermen, outport dealers; and in short the committee will be fully representative of the entire fishing interests of the

country into their hands will be placed the power to make the necessary laws to improve the cure and establish a standard for export. The most important step to be taken in this movement for a better quality is that fish will no longer be permitted to be accepted talqual. We must cut out that practice, and in its stead we must have three grades or standards of fish, Number One, Number Two, and Three, and the difference between the prices paid or the one and two grades must be so great that the man who makes number two fish this year will be sure to make Number One next year. Personally, I should like to see the difference in the prices not less than two dollars. At the same time we must not be too hard on the fishermen; on the contrary, we should encourage him by giving prizes or bonuses, or some other inducement to make good fish. But the man who buys inferior fish in the hope of being able to dispose of it as a superior article will be the loser; if he buys Number Two, he won't be allowed to sell it for Number One, because not a fish will be allowed to go out without being subjected to the strictest inspection, and when those who will at first be disposed to evade the law in this way find that they cannot get away with it, they will soon make up their minds that the sooner they get into line with the regulations the better, and in this way we will ultimately be putting out an article that all the markets will be demanding as fast and in as large quantities as we will be able to supply.

When the F. P. U. members were on the other side of the House, we talked persistently of this matter of standardization of fish and the necessity for a strict cull, and it has been always the aim of the Union to encourage the making of good fish and to see fish paid for according to its quality. It is a sad thing to see the way Labrador fish is handled. A man brings along fish to one buyer who refuses to touch it because he does not consider it good enough. It may be dark or dirty or have some other fault; but that man brings the same fish to another buyer who takes it, and dark and damp and all as it is, packs it into a vessel amongst other fish as Number One.

This must be prevented if we are to send good fish to the foreign markets; for 100 quintals of bad fish are enough to spoil a whole cargo. I saw a cargo landed when I was on the other side, into which yaffles of bad fish had been stowed here and there, and you could tell every yaffle of it as it came out. It went all through the cargo and did more harm than could be imagined. It would have been better for that man if he had kept that fish together and sold it for what it was worth.

The standardization of fish here is not only going to do incalculable good for our trade, but you will then be enabled to give the man on the other side what he wants, and get your money in St John's when your fish is loaded. As the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition pointed out, it is not altogether the fault of the fishermen. He is not going to wash his fish, as clean as he ought to, if he can get the same price for it without doing that.

I don't consider that the men who make bad fish should be blamed for the quality. If they couldn't sell it they wouldn't produce it, and the men who buy are the men who are responsible for it. These new laws of standardization have power to attend to everything that is necessary in the making of fish and the control of fish from the time it is caught until it reaches the consumer on the other side. Rules and Regulations will be

brought in time and again with the approval of the Governor in Council for the improvement of the cure. You cannot formulate a rule or regulation in any Bill prescribed here for the proper enforcement of an improved cure. It must be done through a commission and we must be guided by experience from time to time and thereby make the proper adjustments. I think this is a move in the right direction. We cannot succeed unless our fish is able to compete with the fish of other countries. The Norwegian fisherman does not cure his fish. He catches it only. It is bought by large plants and cured. The fisherman in Norway only catches the fish. but in this country every fisherman makes his own fish and almost every one of them makes it differently. Today we are up against the competition of a country that makes a better looking article than we do. They have a clean looking and better looking fish than we have. Yet, their fish is not as good in taste as ours. If our fishermen would take more care in the splitting and washing of fish the result would be significant and the quality would demand the price. We should split our fish to the tip of the tail, take out more bone, make a slanting cut in taking off the sound bone instead of the usual straight cut and thus remove all the blood in the bone.

The liver adhering to the nape should be removed. All shore fish over 18 inches should have the black removed from the napes. Fish must be washed singly and the back washed as thoroughly as the face. I shall do all in my power to make these improvements a reality. I know my friends on the other side of the House, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition and Sir John Crosbie will assist me in putting through a bill that will have for its object the making of as good an article of fish as supplied by Norway or Iceland. It may not be done in a year. It may take two or three years, but what we want to do now is to make that fish so that it will demand the best price. Spanish importers are to-day selling some fish at 60/- per quintal, but the seller of that fish was carrying a bad article and had to take 60/- for it because that's all it was worth. Such fish was dunn or going slimy and went to Spain before the regulations came into force.

When the bill comes before this House for discussion and we get down to the matter of the standardization of fish we will be able to go into these matters more clearly. For the present I wish my remarks to go through the reporter's box to the fishermen and exporters in order to enable all to start a discussion on those matters of vital interest to the whole country.

Mr. friend Mr. Walsh, the Hon. member for Placentia and St. Mary's District, in speaking on the speech from the throne referred to the need of aids to navigations on the Southern Shore. I may say in reply to Mr. Walsh that a commission has been appointed consisting of Capt. English, Commander Fenn, and Mr. J. J. Collins, Superintendent of the Marconi Wireless Co., to enquire into these conditions relative to aids to navigation along the Southern Shore and report if there is any way in their wisdom to improve the aid to navigation between here and Cape Race.

There is at present a Directional Finding Station at Cape Race and if another such station could be built at Cape Spear or Signal Hill, I am sure we would eliminate all possibility of any steamer going ashore between these two stations providing they use their wireless. The directional station at Cape Race gives a ship her direction but can't give the distance from land. A second station at Cape Spear would

enable all ships to find the distance from the land consequently all risks of striking land in a fog or storm would be removed.

If my friends of the other side of the House can suggest anything to remedy the conditions on this shore we will be very pleased to discuss it with them. In reference to the survey of ships, although it may not be possible for my staff to inspect every ship that sails out of this Colony we may at least provide that they all be equipped with sufficient lifeboats and lifebuoys to guarantee the sailors a fighting chance for their lives, and I welcome any information that may be supplied me that will tend to locate any offenders against those necessary and desirable regulations.

In regard to getting a supply of salt for the coming season I expect that we shall be able to secure salt this year much cheaper than last year, despite the fact that the cost of freight has increased 20/- per ton. You talk of war prices, why last year we could get a ton of salt freighted from Spain for 25/— and to-day we must pay 45/— and yet we hope to be able to sell salt this year at a considerable reduction on last year's price of $4.70 cash.

Mr. Speaker, it was my duty to inform the House of these regulations and what they meant, but it is not my duty to take up the time of the House as the gentlemen on the other side of the House have done, and as I have done when sitting in their places. Yet I hope they will give me credit for any good I may try to do and encourage me in the work I have set out to accomplish. If I make mistakes I am open to fair criticism. If I do wrong I am open to your censure. I am here because I feel I have a duty to perform in the work I shall endeavour to accomplish during the near future, my labor will be much lighter and success more certain if all will pull together and learn to forget party politics. In my position as Minister of Marine and Fisheries I am the servant of the House and the Country, and any information that I am able to give them from time to time in relation to the regulation and other matters pertaining to my Department I will only be too pleased to supply.

And it being after midnight, Wednesday, April 28th, on motion, the debate on the Address in Reply was adjourned.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Mr. Speaker, unless I receive an assurance that the questions on the Order paper will be answered to-morrow, I will ask that these questions not answered be kept on the Order paper until they are answered.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—All the questions asked were either answered or answers were promised at the earliest possible moment.

MR. SULLIVAN:—I repeat, Sir, that the questions be left on the Order paper.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—That is not the practice. When I was in the Upper House I asked questions the answers to some of which I have not received yet, and I see no reason for letting these questions remaining on the Order paper.

MR. HIGGINS:—Neither is there any reason why these questions should not have been answered.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—The leader of the Government came in here this morning, after keeping us waiting for more than an hour and apologized because the Order paper was not ready.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—The statement of the Leader of the Opposition that I offered an apology is absolutely untrue. The Order paper came late and there was no time to send the questions on it to the Departments to which they related, and the only questions of which I had personal knowledge were answered.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—If my statement is untrue I take it back. I said you apologized and you owed us an apology for keeping the House waiting.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—These questions were not asked till last night.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—That is no reason why they should not have been answered, or at least left on the Order paper now. We want business, not camouflage.

MR. SULLIVAN:—I still contend, Mr. Speaker, that if these questions are not answered to-night, they should be left on the Order paper until they are. Surely we are not asking anything unusual or unreasonable.

HON. MINISTER, POSTS & TELEGRAPHS:—Mr. Speaker, may I give my experience in this particular. When I was on the other side of the House, I often asked questions, and when the Speaker had called these questions they were stricken off the Order paper. Sometimes we had to wait weeks for the answers and often we did not get them at all. Of course, if the head of a Department to whom a question is directed is absent from the House it is right that it should be left on the Order paper, but if he is present and states that the answer is in course of preparation, that should be sufficient.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—I think that any question on the Order paper for a day when the House meets at 10.30 might be put on a second time.

MR. HIGGINS:—That is the idea; that is all we ask for.

Mr. Moore gave notice of question.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Justice, the bill entitled "An Act respecting the effect and Application of Certain Acts subsequent to Consolidated Statutes (Third Series)" 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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Industrial Societies Act, 1919," 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 wih a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act to amend Cap. 41 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Newfoundland Medical Board," 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 pro visions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Food Control Act, 1917" 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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Department of Public Works 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 thec oncurrence of that body in its provisions.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

Mr. Moore gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that

when the House rises, it adjourn until three of the clock this afternoon.

The House adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, April 28th, 1920.

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

Mr. Sullivan gave notice of question.

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled report of the Council of Higher Education.

MR. SMALL:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Rencontre for telegraphic communication in that place. This petition is signed by 184 inhabitants of Rencontre and New Harbor, which people will also benefit by such communication. I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that for some years these people have been practically isolated. There is no telegraphic line to Burgeo, a distance of 100 miles, and the people in Rencontre and vicinity are living isolated practically as much as the residents of Northern Labrador. I think this line is due the people of that place. The amount of revenue taken from these people in one year runs into thousands and thousands of dollars and they get absolutely nothing in return. I do not see why they should be deprived of the privileges that other settlements of far less importance are enjoying. They should not be handicapped in this way. There are many business men there who do not enjoy even a decent coastal service and you can't get a doctor unless you take a motor boat or other vessel and go to Harbour Breton, a distance of about 60 miles. And, Mr. Speaker, we must take into consideration the position of the returned soldiers who have gone back to settle down in Rencontre and the nearby settlements. Many of them volunteered and went overseas from Rencontre, are we going to ignore these boys? Are we going to send they back there and banish them altogether. I think, Sir, that if this telegraph line is not due business men then it is certainly due the soldiers. No doubt it is a pretty hard place in which to erect a station, and no doubt surveyors will go up there and come back and say that it is impossible But, Mr. Speaker, I say that it is not impossible.

When the Anglo line was first brought through this district the settlements were not taken into consideration, but I suggest Sir, that it can be done and Rencontre can have a telegraph system. I will ask the support of the Hon. Minister of Justice in presenting this petition. I presume that he is acquainted with this part of my district which borders on his own, and I ask his support. I think Mr. Walsh, the Hon. Member for Placentia and St. Mary's will also support me in this petition, as I know that he has considerable knowledge of the needs of Rencontre and is well acquainted with the district.

MR. WALSH:—I have very much pleasure in giving my support to the petition presented by the hon. member for Burgeo, Lieut. Small. It is true, as he says, that I have had experience along the coast line, and I am familiar with conditions in the settlement of Rencontre. It has been said and it is true that most of the telegraph offices that have been established are not a paying proposition, that the revenue from them was not sufficient to pay for their upkeep, but a telegraph office is a necessity to the people of that settlement, and I take this opportunity of giving my support to the petition presented by Lieut. Small, and I hope the same measure of support will be given me with reference to requests that are now before the House for the District which I have the honor to represent. I have no doubt that when these matters come before the Executive due consideration will be given them,

and I hope Rencontre will be given this great facility.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I support the petition presented by the hon. member for Burgeo for two reasons, first because I represent a constituency on the South Coast, which is connected with Lieut. Small's district, and because I am familiar with conditions there; and secondly because I know that these offices are essential, but we are laboring under great difficulties for this reason: The Postal Telegraphs run by the Government do not go farther west than the east end of Hermitage Bay. To erect a postal telegraph office at Gaultois one has to run a cable from Hermitage to Gaultois in order to reach there. When you come to Push-through the Anglo-American Telegraph Company runs through the district of Burgeo.

Like Mr. Small I am in the same position in Bay D'Espoir, a place which is shortly to be the seat of an industry, which we hope will be equal to Grand Falls, and a population of one thousand has no office except one run by the Anglo-American Telegraph Company. It is at Conne River, miles away from any place of importance. Now if I want to get a telegraph office at St. Alban's, I have to make arrangements with the Anglo Co., to let us connect up with their office, and my honorable friend will find himself in the same position, that unless he can come to an arrangement with the Anglo-American Telegraph Co., you have got to erect a new system of Postal Telegraphs from Bay D'Espoir West.

Now it comes to a question whether we should consider buying out the interests of the Anglo-American Co. on the West Coast. I don't know that they are doing very much business now, because places that are asking for telegraph offices are not connected with the line, and I think it would be worth while to see if the Government can make some arrangement with the Anglo-American Telegraph If this is not done, it will cost a lot to put telegraph offices in these places. I shall take the earliest opportunity of bringing the matter before the Government.

MR. MacDONNELL:—Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition from the settlement of Sandy Point, Bay St. George, concerning three very important matters, and it is signed by all the inhabitants of the place.

The first matter is that Sandy Point is no longer a port of call, and they request it be again made a port or call for coastal boats. The second is in connection with the extension of a breakwater. The land there, Sir, is very low lying, of a sandy nature, and unless the breakwater is extended, we shall lose the harbor altogether, as each year more and more of this point is being washed away. If we lose it we shall not have a harbor in Bay St. George.

Some years ago a similar petition was presented on this very important matter. The people went so far as to offer to give free labor, and to supply the material for this work. That offer was accepted, and the first year each man brought from the woods two cords of timber, and was given a certain amount of money. The second year they brought the timber and received no money. I think when people are willing to give free labor that they should be given assistance. I suggest that this matter be referred to the Marine and Fisheries Department, and if it is taken up by them I would like to discuss this matter with them.

The petition states that the man who runs the ferry is satisfactory, but they request that he should be paid more, in order that it may be

worth his while to give his whole attention to it. At the present time he is not paid enough, and that if it were increased he would be able to make an additional number of trips. The fact that it is signed by every man in the settlement, should be sufficient to convince the members of this House of the desirability of its being granted.

MR. SCAMMELL:—Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition from the people of St. Barbe that that place be made a port of call for the coastal boats during the coming season. I consider that that petition is very reasonable, and I have very much pleasure in giving it my support, and I beg to refer it to the department to which it relates.

HON. MINISTER POSTS & TELEGRAPHS:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a number of petitions all dealing with the same subject, namely the extension of the railway from Heart's Content to the south shore of Trinity Bay and as far as Old Perlican. This section was not in the original railway contract, for some reason, when the branch line was being done from Whitbourne to Heart's Content. This is a very important section, not alone in Trinity, but in the Dominion. Between ten and fifteen years ago there were a number of schooners at Hant's Harbour and other places nearby that traded between the different localities and St. John's. Now there is only one schooner used as a freighter there. It is a great fishing centre, especially around Brownsdale, Lead Cove and New Melbourne and in spite of the isolation, drawbacks and hardships these people have settled there, owing to the fact that they are near the fishing grounds. It is difficult to them to live and the people could not leave to go elsewhere to fish if they wanted to, as nobody else would go in there to buy their extensive fishing property and land. Consequently these people are making a great sacrifice. If, as has been said by nearly everybody, that the success of the country depends upon the fisheries, these petitions are of more than passing interest. They have no means now of getting their products away after catching and curing them. I know of one or two cases last year and the previous year in which people had to haul their products over an inaccessible road to Old Perlican and then put them on board the train for St. John's. The cartage was 40 cents and the freight was 80 cents so that an allowance of $2.00 had to be made on every quintal of fish, apart from the loss of time, etc.

I have great pleasure in supporting these petitions, although I realise the problems and the difficulties in line. But if the government is going to do anything with railways I trust that this new line will be given first consideration and at the earliest possible moment. The petitions are not unreasonable and I have reason to believe that promises were made by past governments in this direction. Therefore, we are committed to it to a certain extent. I hope that the Government will see its way clear to grant the request of the petitioners.

MR. TARGETT:—Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the prayer of the petition. I may say that there is no part of that district from Hant's Harbor to Lead Cove where the people are in a worse condition with regard to the shipping of their fish. It is a very rough section and last year people had their ships and stages swept away by heavy sea. As stated by my colleague, Mr. Halfyard, these men there from New Melbourne down to Lead Cove find it difficult to get away their fish. Thirty years ago there were plenty of schooners there but there is only one

there now. And I have known that schooners have had to wait six weeks before getting in there, last year, owing to the heavy sea running. These people lost their stages and slips were destroyed. I trust that if the Government are going to do anything with branch railways that they will not forget the South Side of Trinity Bay, as it is as much needed as any place in the country.

MR. GUPPY:—Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the prayer of the petition.

MR. SMALL:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Isle aux Morts asking that that place be made a permanent port of call of the s.s. Portia. Isle aux Mort is a growing little settlement. Four or five years ago there was only one business man there. To-day we have three business men there and we have from 50 to 65 fishermen there with all modern appliances to catch fish. This place has not as yet been recognized by any of our coastal boats and I suggest that this petition be referred to the Department of Shipping and hope that Isle aux Morts will be made a port of call of the Portia.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the Bill entitled "An Act to provide for the Better Obtaining of Information Respecting the Cod Fishery," was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Mr. Sullivan asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House:

(1) A statement showing what moneys if any have been sent to the district of Placentia & St. Mary's since November 30th, 1919.
(2) And to say to whom sent.
(3) And for what purpose and also by whose request the money was allocated.

Mr. Sullivan asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House all correspondence between the Great War Veterans and the Government in connection with increased pensions and allowances to sailors and soldiers and dependents, and to say:

(1) If the request for a temporary measure only, and until the scale of pensions is amended, is it the intention of the Government to allow the following increases:
   (a) Total disability, 20 per cent. increase.
   (b) Orphans of sailors and soldiers, 20 per cent. increase.
   (c) Children of deceased sailors and soldiers, 20 per cent. increase.
   (d) All other cases where deceased or totally disabled sailors or soldiers was or is the sole support, 20 per cent. increase.
(2) Also is it the intention of the Government to make this increase retroactive from November 15th, 1919.
(3) And is it the intention of the Government to carry out the policy in connection with returned soldiers and sailors as outlined in the Prime Minister's Manifesto issued in October, 1919, as follows:

"I propose that the soldier lad and navy lad of Newfoundland, the record of whose deeds is as good as the record of any body of men in Great Britain or in the British Colonies, shall be placed upon the same status as the soldiers of the neighboring Dominion in the matter of pensions, disability allowances, gratuities, pensions and allowances to dependents and financial and other assistance to enable them to get back to a peace basis and earn their living as honorable and independent cit-

izens. The boys who by their sacrifice, their achievements and death have made the name of Newfoundland famous and won for us a place of honor in the world war are worthy of every reasonable consideration to their parents, and wife and children, must not be permitted to suffer because of the heroism and sacrifice of those upon whom they were dependent for comfort and support."

Mr. Walsh asked the Hon. the Minister of Public Works if it is his intention to accept the recommendation of the elected members of Placentia and St. Mary's with regard to the matters coming under his jurisdiction as head of the Department of Public Works.

Mr. Walsh asked the Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if it is his intention to accept the recommendations of the constitutionally elected members for Placentia and St. Mary's, with regard to public matters in connection with said district coming under the jurisdiction of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Dr. Jones to ask the Hon. Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines:

(1) What agreement, if any, has been made with Mr. John Moore of Avondale, for attendance on sick cattle in the District of Harbor Main.
(2) What qualifications has Mr. Moore for such employment.
(3) For what period has he been engaged, and on what terms.
(4) Whether he has made or is expected to make reports on the work performed and the number of animals attended by him.
(5) If any claims have been made against the Department for losses of cattle, said to be due to his attendance, giving particulars of same, and what settlement if any has been or will be made in connection with same.

Dr. Jones to ask the Minister Public Works if any claim has been made against the Department of Public Works for compensation for damages done to the motor car which was precipitated into the harbor at Avondale by reason of improper protection on the main line of road, during the summer 1919.

Also what amount has been paid, if any, for compensation; and what measures have been taken to prevent the recurrence of such accidents at this point.

Mr. Moore to ask the Minister of Finance and Customs to furnish this House with a list of officials dismissed in connection with his Department from the outports and St. John's offices sinces the present Government came into power, and name of each; also a statement of charge against each.

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

MR. LeGROW:—Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to take up much of the time of this House. But I want to congratulate the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on the splendid way in which he handled the matter of the fish regulations, and I feel quite sure that the members of the Opposition also feel that there is every justification for the regulations as proved by the great work that has been accomplished by them so far. I also want to extend my hearty congratulations to my friend, Mr. Cheeseman, on the able manner in which he has dealt with the fish regulations. There can be no doubt that the regulations are for the best interests of the country.

I wish to thank the gentlemen on the other side of the House for their

kindly references to my soldier friend, Mr. Small, and myself. They are the judges of our conduct and we will have to stand by it. Now with regard to the sectarian cry, I want to say right here that I am not guilty of the sectarianism which I am blamed for using in last fall's election. I am not guilty of carrying around a picture of His Holiness the Pope, but I can say something of that picture. When I came back to St. John's a soldier friend said to me: "LeGrow, you won your election all right." I said yes; I worked hard for it. I am not guilty of carrying around a picture of His Holiness the Pope, but I am prepared to prove that such a picture was used by one of The News bunch, and I am prepared to take an affidavit to that effect. If there are any of The News staff here they can take down what I say. When Mr. Matthews went to Trinity Bay he faced certain defeat. It is one of the districts which Mr. Bennett has said were conceded to the Opposition last fall. If I had been defeated I do not think that the Opposition would come across with a seat for me. Mr. Hickman told the people of Bay de Verde District, even around my own town, that I was only a boy. I am not ashamed of the fact that I am a poor boy. When Mr. Matthews was defeated he acted like a man, but Mr. Hickman, who opposed me, acted like a whipped child. I told him that when I came back from the district I would prove to him who was the boy.

MR. CHEESEMAN:—Mr. Speaker: In rising for the first time I would take this opportunity of congratulating you on the high honor conferred upon you, in your appointment as Speaker for this House, and I feel that the honor has not only been done you, but the fishermen of the colony in general from whose ranks you have come.

Like many Hon. members who are occupying seats in this House to-day, I cannot boast of any parliamentary experience, but I am proud to say that I have the honor to represent one of the most important constituencies in this dominion, and it is one which depends entirely upon the fisheries; consequently it is fishery matters that I wish to deal with principally this afternoon. Any suggestion coming either from the government or the opposition, that will tend to make matters better for the fishermen of this dominion will have my greatest support.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition in his remarks referred to conditions as they were in this country some thirty years ago. He showed that the business of the country was then practically controlled by Water Street merchants, but conditions have changed. Water Street is not controlling the whole business of the country to-day. The outports are coming into their own. We have come to take a prominent part in the general business of the country in a business-like way, and I am sure you will agree we are doing justice to the undertaking. You have only to look around you, and you will see the country is not represented only by men from Water Street, as was often the case. You will find that men are coming from the outports to take part in the government of the country and I think that this is a move in the right direction. The Hon. Leader of the Government is an outport man, so is the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, before going further, I would like to state that I have listened with a great deal of interest and attention to the speeches made

by the Honorable members of the Opposition, and in my opinion they have been very reasonable and interesting to a young man just entering Parliament. I was particularly struck with the speeches made by Lieut. Small and Sergt LeGrow on the Government side, and my honorable friend, Mr. Fox on the Opposition. I am sure that all will agree that the speeches delivered by all three gentlemen whom I have mentioned were worthy of the great attention they received from both sides of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I do not pose as an expert on fishery matters or fishing, therefore all that I say might not be correct. The fish regulations have been well advertised both at home and abroad. The Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, with whose department the regulations are particularly connected, has explained them in such an able manner that I believe every member feels satisfied that he has made an honest effort to improve conditions for the fishermen of the Colony. Mr. Coaker tackled a big job and I am sure everyone will agree, that he has handled it in such a manner that he has done a great credit to himself and his fellow countrymen. I am not familiar with the Italian, Spanish or Brazilian markets, but judging from what the Hon Minister of Marine and Fisheries has told us about those markets I feel sure that the regulations have been a great benefit in as far as they concern the aforesaid markets. Referring to Brazil, I have in my mind an outportman who last year sent a cargo of fish to Brazil. They told me a little while ago that it took nearly nine months to get the full payment for this cargo. They of course shipped that cargo under the old system. The same firm that I referred to shipped another cargo a few days ago and understand they have already sold and that they have received ninety per cent of the sale price in cash. To my mind the case that I have just referred to is in itself a justification of the fish regulations at any rate in as far as Brazil is concerned. Take the position of the outport business man who is trying to build up a business for himself. Very few of them have any capital to start with. Now I want to point out to this House what a great advantage it would be to us if we could sell our fish to foreign buyers for cash against documents instead of having to send it to Europe on consignment. Having to buy our trade requirements for cash they take these goods to the outports and sell them to fishermen on six or nine months credit, and even then we have to take fish as payment for our goods. And under the old system it would take us very often from six to nine months to get cash returns for our fish shipments, you will appreciate the fact that the man with a limited amount of capital has a hard proposition. If it can be made possible to sell our fish for cash against documents it will be a great thing for the small business man and exporter, it will give the small man an equal chance with the big man, and as a consequence the whole country will benefit. As far as the West Coast is concerned our principal market for many years past has been Portugal. This was perhaps largely due to the fact that for some years past the largest percentage of our shipments were bank fish, and Portugal offers the best market for bank fish. However, within recent years conditions have changed along the coast. The banking fleet is rapidly decreasing and the fishermen who formerly went to the Banks are now engaged in the shore fishery.

But with this change we will have

to divert a part of our attention to Brazil. The shore fishermen bring in a large quantity of fish that is very suitable for this market. I understand that it is necessary to have the fish very dry in order to get the best results from Brazil, and I should say that it would pay any Brazil exporter to install a modern fish-drying plant. I feel confident that in the very near future the West Coast shippers will be placing a portion of the collections in Brazil and I also feel sure that they will ship fish of a quantity that will be second to none either from St. John's or elsewhere.

Such men as Hon. Mr. Coaker, Sir M. P. Cashin and Sir John Crosbie are men who are well qualified to discuss fishery matters. There are also many other members in the House who can undoubtedly furnish much valuable information in connection with our fishing industry. I am satisfied that if we will be big enough to forget our party politics and get down to busines we can now do some valuable work in the interests of the great fisheries.

I have heard a great deal of criticism over the regulations. I daresay that they have not measured up to all that was expected either by the people of the country or the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries himself, but at the same time have sufficient proof that this country has already received profits as results from these regulations. Some individual might have been hit. So what we must consider is the greatest benefit for the greatest number. I have had some little experience with the Portuguese market and the London broker. No doubt there is a good deal of truth in that statement. At the same time there is another side to the story when we talk about the London or European broker. I can cite a case in which my firm was interested. About a year ago, when things were looking pretty good on the other side, we shipped a cargo to Oporto on consignment. We telegraphed our brokers to know when they would advance, and they replied that the selling value was then about 75 shillings per quintal. We drew for the sixty shillings, but what happened? Although six months after we had made the shipment, we received the accurate sales of the shipment from the brokers, which document revealed the very unpleasant news that the shipment against which we had already drawn 60 shillings per quintal had averaged 51 shillings per quintal, and of which he had to pay freight, insurance, commission, brokerage, etc. The result of this transaction was, you can see—we owed the brokers considerable money. What happened in our case which I have just quoted often happens with others who ship fish on consignment—you never know where you are going to get off. If we can make it possible to sell our fish outright we will know what we are doing and be able to conduct our business accordingly. Therefore notwithstanding the fact that the London broker has often been a great help to the small man, outright sales would be a far greater benefit to the same man.

I was particularly interested in the remarks of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition about the catching, curing and handling of fish generally. He is a man of experience and knew what he was speaking about. But he referred only to the foggy days when telling how hard it is for the fishermen to make good fish. But I would like to point out that unfortunately there are some fishermen who do not always take the full advantage of the fine days. While we have every sympathy with the fisherman who is so unfortunate as to have

his fish damaged by bad weather over which he has no control we should have no sympathy with the fisherman who does not take advantage of the fine days to properly cure his fish. Unfortunately for all concerned a great many of our fishermen do not seem to realize the fact that fish is an article of food and that it should and must be treated as such if we are to get the best results. The quicker the fisherman realizes this the better it will be for ourselves. Codfish or any other kind of fish require careful attention from the time they are caught until they are placed in the consumers' hands.

As I have already pointed out the fishermen are not to blame as much as the buyers and exporters. For the past four years it was an easy matter for exporters to get away with poor quality fish and even make considerable money out of it; of course that was due to the fact that Europe was practically starving for fish and we had no competition in the fish markets. However, now that the war is over and our competitors are back again in the field with renewed energy matters will be different and we must immediately prepare to meet competition from Iceland, Norway, etc. One of the quickest and best methods is for us to send over fish of superior quality. If we are to get this superior quality we must immediately point out to the fishermen how important it is that they should produce a superior article, then if they fail they will only have themselves to blame; and to their sorrow they will eventually pay the penalty by losing their markets. It would be very unfair to blame the fishermen at the present time seeing that we exporters in our desire to get ahead of each other have really encouraged them into a loose and careless manner of curing. At the present time if you tell a fisherman that his fish are not well dried or the quality is poor, he will reply (and justly so) that why should he cure his fish well when the other fellow who brings along an inferior quality can get just as much for it as the man with good quality. There is not at the present time any encouragement for the fishermen to make good fish. Let the law get after the exporter and see that he really ships the quality represented on his bills of lading. When the exporter finds that he must ship the quality represented he will be more careful in buying and when the fisherman finds it pays better to have good fish than bad they will do their best to have it good. We must throw aside our political views and get down to united effort and in a very short time the results will be apparent to all.

I heartily congratulate the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries on intimating that he will bring in a bill for the standardization of fish. I believe that it will receive the unqualified support of every member who has any interest in the fishermen of the country.

The object of the new regulations have been clearly defined by the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I endorse all that he has said. Mr. Coaker has the interest of the country and the fishermen at heart, and will, I believe, in due course prove it to the satisfaction of all.

About two weeks ago our firm shipped a cargo of fish and within that short time we have been able to sell it at eighty-one shillings per quintal, cash against documents. Is that not better than sending it over on consignment and having to wait six or eight months for the payment? This sale was made through our Trade Commissioner, Mr. Stephen Smith. To my mind this transaction

is not only a justification for the regulations, but is also a good reason why we should have trade commissioners in every market where our products are sent. We should have had them years ago. The London broker is undoubtedly an honest fellow, but at the same time why should we have a man in London doing what our own men can do with much better results.

I can quite realize that some of the big men of St. John's are opposed to the regulations, because to my mind under this system the small man and the big man will have an equal chance. While it is true that some of the big men of the city have often helped some of the small outport men, it is also true that many of them have often been opposed to matters that they thought would help the outport man to get to the top of the business ladder. When the outport merchant can ship his fish direct there is no reason why it should be sent to St. John's. Today's news from Portugal is very encouraging. I notice that the total consumption for the past week in Oporto was eight thousand quintals, or three thousand more than the previous week. Eight thousand quintals is a big consumption for Oporto at this time of the year. And in Lisbon last week there was an increase of twelve hundred quintals in the consumption over the week previous.

It is encouraging to know that the stocks held on the other side are being cleaned up. At the present rate of consumption Portugal will be wanting more fish before we will have any ready to send over. The winter catch on the West Coast was very small this year consequently we will not have much to send forward until September or October. I see no reason why we should despair, but at the same time we must be very careful and it is necessary for us to stand together and make a united effort in the interest of our fishing industry. We should have a propaganda in South America to boost our fish trade. There also ought to be a propaganda in this country in connection with the proper curing of fish. If we play our part well the fishermen will look after theirs and the consequence will be a happy and prosperous people, and where people are happy and prosperous there can be no Bolshevism. I feel sure that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and his associates will do their duty regardless of party politics.

Hon. Mr. Bennett in his speech referred to the housing problem in the city of St. John's. There is lots of room in the outports where men can work hard and be healthy and comfortable. Why do they not come to the outports to live if they are not satisfied with conditions in the city.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words about the high cost of living. Being engaged in business myself there is no reason why I should not be called a profiteer too, and probably I am—"wait and see." In our business we handle practically everything from a needle to an anchor, and I think I ought to know something about where profits are likely to be found. All the enquiry boards center their whole attention on flour and a few other food commodities. That would be alright if it was only necessary for us to have food. The people of this country must have clothes as well as food. It is quite true that the price of provisions and groceries is very high, but if the enquiry board would divert a little of its attention to the stores that sell dry goods, hardware, boots and shoes, they might find something of interest to the consumers.

The coastal service, well, Mr.

Speaker, it is in a very bad condition, and while we blamed the late government for it they are now blaming us. However I am satisfied that the present government will tackle the matter with earnestness and do their best to improve matters. As far as the South West Coast is concerned we have to depend entirely upon the coastal service. We do not enjoy the advantage of a railway and in Burin District we have not even a good road.

Mr. Speaker, before closing I wish to touch upon a matter, a delicate subject. It is sectarianism, and before I say anything further on the matter I wish to congradulate a gentleman on the other side of the house in the person of Mr. Fox, who handled the matter with skilful tact. It is only too true that for some time this has been going on, The serpent has been continually crawling into new ground. I believe that the newspapers are to blame for a great deal of it. Educated men who read this sectarian stuff in the papers pass it over with a feeling of disgust. But it is in the small outports where unfortunately educated people are only too often very scarce, that is where the newspaper that prints sectarian stuff often does a great deal of harm. Many outport people only see a newspaper at election times and then unfortunately they often take them too seriously. If they see an account in the paper that some one is attacking their religious organization it often makes them antagonistic to the church to which that person belongs. Such articles often create an outburst of sectarian feeling where good friendship and the best feeling had hitherto existed regardless of what altar they worshipped at. All the newspapers should refuse to publish such vile stuff as we have seen appear in them in the past. I think that the Prime Minister and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition ought to see that the papers supporting them are kept free from sectarian stuff, we might then get some clear literature. When we were campaigning in Burin District we advised the people to disregard the papers one and all. Denomination or religion was not mixed up with politics in our district.

MR. HIBBS:—Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of making a few observations on the matter before the chair, before proceeding, however, I wish to extend to you, Sir, my most cordial congratulations on the very high honour you have attained in being elected to the position of First Commoner of the Land. You have reached a position of great eminence and in congratulating you, I feel that I can do that Sir, with a greater degree of sincerity because I stayed right here and voted for you, and did not vacate my seat on that occasion.

MR. HIGGINS:—We did not do that out of disrespect for the Speaker.

MR. HIBBS:—I hope not, for your own sakes.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to join with the other speakers in congratulating the two hon. and gallant gentlemen who proposed and seconded the Address in Reply, Lieut. Small and Sergeant Major LeGrow, who have performed such splendid service on behalf of this Dominion in France and Flanders and have also done themselves honour here to-day. I am proud that we have two representatives of the Royal Newfoundland Regiment here with us, and I regret very much that we have not a representative of the Navy also.

The hon. member for St. John's West, Mr. Bennett, stated yesterday that the late Government had endeavoured to place a representative of Britain's right arm in this Assembly, in

the person of Mr. Matthews, who contested the District of Trinity. I will not go as far as the hon. member for St. John's West and say that a district should be opened without contest for gentlemen who served in either branch of His Majesty's Forces, but I do say Sir, that when a representative of the Army or Navy appealed to a district for political support he should at least be treated decently.

Mr. Matthews could not be elected in Trinity Bay last fall. He was associated with the wrong party.

No person who knew anything about the conditions North of Baccalieu expected to see the election results any different from what they were. It was no surprise to anyone that he was not elected, for it was a foregone conclusion that he had no chance. Even the Leader of the Opposition himself knew that his candidates would be defeated in Trinity Bay. The surprise to me is that they secured the vote they did get. I have yet to discover how they polled even the small vote they received under the circumstances.

To use the words of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, I wish to jog his memory and remind him that we also endeavoured to place a representative of the Navy in this House in the person of Captain Walter Kennedy, who appealed to his native district after spending nearly four years in the North Sea, but unfortunately for the District of Harbour Main he was defeated. However, he took his medicine like a man. In regard to those two men there was just this difference, that while Matthews was treated decently, Capt. Kennedy was set upon, beaten and treated generally in a most outrageous manner.

MR. HIGGINS:—The evidence did not prove that.

MR. HIBBS:—I happen to know something about that evidence. There are times, Mr. Speaker, when it is difficult to restrain one's self especially when one is speaking conscientiously and knows what he is talking about. It has always been an accepted truism that those who live in glass houses should never throw stones, especially Sir, when those at whom the missles are directed are entrenched behind an impregnable fortress of honest purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries on the clear, concise and able explanation he has just given us with regard to the Fishery Regulations. We have heard a lot of adverse criticism of these regulations and a great deal of talk about the ruin they were going to cause, but I think that it must be admitted now that the opponents of the movement entertained mistaken opinions, and I believe this is quite clear even to the honourable gentlemen on the other side of the House.

And Sir, I want to point out and I do so in a good-natured spirit, that if in my criticisms of the hon. gentlemen in the Opposition benches I should say anything to disturb their feelings they must look upon it as a mistake of the head rather than of the heart. I do not want to pose as a political purist, but I do want to be fair and honest, and in any observations I shall make I shall call a spade a spade.

Our political opponents outside and hon. friends opposite are pleased to term some of us "Coaker Members" of which we are proud, but I would like to take this early opportunity of stating that personally I hold opinions of my own, and I hope the day will never come when I shall fear to stand up here and express them.

Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to magnify the sins of the late Government under Sir Michael Cashin, for God knows they were great enough. The electorate of this country have dealt with that in the most democratic

way, and have punished them for their political transgressions, consequently, but a remnant to-day sits on the Opposition side of this chamber, but I want to point out to the House and to the country the remarkable conversion that has overtaken some of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and the manner in which they have so suddenly forgotten their past sin. I would like to know the secret of their sudden repentance and conversion. It might be that the Opposition side of the House has some wonderful influence for good or that there is a peculiar kind of magnetism in the seats which requires one to but touch them and in the twinkling of an eye so to speak, becomes purged of his political sins, and develops all at once a wonderful zealousness for the welfare and interests of the people and this country. Naturally, as a youngster in this House I am curious to know why it is that all these things of which we now hear so much of did not occur to these honourable gentlemen before.

Some of my friends here on this side have passed thro' the Opposition fire also and have become purged, and that's one of the reasons I am glad to be associated with them. Now, they will try to do some good for the country from the Government side.

Sir Michael Cashin has held a prominent seat in the Government of this country for many years and was Prime Minister up to the time that the people turned his party out, but he evidently forgot to even attempt to perform any of the good things he so eloquently described in that long speech he delivered here during the last day or two. There is not a conceivable public need or requirement that he has not aired since his political conversation took place.

Some of our Opposition friends had no need of the conversion spark, and of course these do not deserve so much credit as the others, for there is more rejoicing over one sinner who repenteth than over ninety-nine just persons who need no repentance and those who have been purged I suppose are the better for it.

Mr. Speaker, I have had some connection with this House before I became a member of it. I will not tell the story now, but merely say that although the honorable Leader of the Opposition and myself had a passage at arms on one occasion I have long since forgiven him and there is no ill-feeling. I have always had the greatest respect and veneration for the honorable gentleman. It had been said that he was to sever his connection with public life in this country, and leave for some more congenial clime, and I heard that with real regret, for I look upon him as the only link which now connects us in this House with the political life of the Colony for a quarter of a century past. In spite of our political differences I want to say that Sir Michael Cashin's name is writ large on the pages of this country's history, and there are many things throughout the years that redound to his credit.

But to continue, Sir, we have heard a lot of late about affidavits, and it reminds me of the saying that it's an ill wind that blows nobody good," for if the gentlemen of the Opposition had not this they would have nothing to hang their hopes and arguments on. Considering their recent record I do not know how they would feel facing a Government that has been returned to power with a larger majority of votes, and a greater victory geographically than any previous government in the history of the country.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—You are mistaken; what about Bond in 1900?

MR. HIBBS:—I said the greatest majority in votes cast, and I think I am right.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN::—No, you are not.

MR. HIBBS:—Very well, Sir Michael, I won't argue that point, but I maintain that geographically our victory was the greatest. We represent practically all the Districts except a few seats on the Peninsula of Avalon and that of the District of St. George's, but it will be remembered that the gentleman who represents that District was elected on the ticket of this Government and by the assistance of the policy of the Leader of this Government. It is true he has strayed away from the fold, but I have no doubt he will be with us again if we want him.

MR. MacDONNELL:—There will be a great many sheep astray from that fold before I go back.

MR. HIBBS:—But, Sir, there's another question I want to deal with, and it is a very delicate one, and one that is sometimes very much misconstrued. It is the question of sectarianism, in which many of us are great sinners. One would infer from the speech of the honorable member for St. John's West, Mr. Bennett, that the Government party appealed and won their seats on a sectarian issue. I want to throw back that charge, for it is false and unfounded.

Now I deplore the fact that sectarianism has been used in the campaign. I won't say that it hasn't been used, because if I did I would be a great hypocrite. Since I knew what politics meant. I have known creeds to be used to a greater or lesser extent by unscrupulous men. I profess the Anglican faith. I belong to the District of Harbor Main and I was born and brought up in a Roman Catholic settlement. I was reared among Catholic friends and relatives who stand nearest and dearest to me; in my boyhood days I attended no other but a Roman Catholic school, and I say here today that there are Catholics I would give my life blood for, if need be, and they, I believe, for me. But let me explain the issue as I have seen it. Has it not always been said that on a political issue our Catholic friends stand more firmly together, but you can easily split up the Protestants?

MR. HIGGINS:—The reverse would be nearer the truth.

MR. HIBBS:—Perhaps so now, but we have to our shame and discredit been using our religious creeds in the past as political organizations. If you sow the seeds, nourish and foster this sectarian canker worm, and later on get hurt by this serpent of your own creation, then you have your own selves to blame. Here are the plain facts, Mr. Speaker:

The denominational division of this country is about one-third Catholic to two-thirds Protestant. The natural outcome of playing off one religion against the other, as I have stated, is to rally the Protestant body more closely together, and as they are in the majority, there can be only one result. I am assuming now, Sir, that the hon. member for St. Johns' West is right in the conclusions he arrived at as to the cause of the denominational make up of the present assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I deplore this state of affairs. Personally I am not a sectarian firebug. I never judge any man by the altar he worships at or the way in which he says his prayers.

Let us then try as gentlemen and Newfoundlanders to stamp out this canker worm that is sapping our social and religious life. What we have to say let it be said here, and the man or men who uses the sacredness of religion to get a seat in this House should in future be hounded out of public life.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few

words in reference to the speech delivered by Mr. Fox. I think it was one of the finest speeches that I ever listened to, and I believe it expressed the sentiments and character of the man. I thought as I heard him speak I would watch his career, as I believe such men as he will tend to elevate our political life. I am told that he took a broad stand on his first political platform last fall, and I am prepared to admit that he was in good company in the persons of my hon. friends Messrs. Higgins and Vinicombe. I look upon Mr. Fox as a young man of exceptionally good character. When he made his statements in this House last Friday night I came to the conclusion that he was the model type of Newfoundlander.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—What about Mr. Cheeseman?

MR. HIBBS:—He is also a splendid type of young man. I want to say here, Sir, that men like Mr. Fox can be a great power in ridding this country of the sectarian canker referred to. I understand that Dr. Campbell, the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, has imported some canker proof potatoes this year. If we don't improve politically, I hope someone will import 36 canker-proof politicians for the next general election.

There have been some very unseemingly things done during the past campaign, but as it always touches a sore spot to mention these things, and as I have imbibed a little Coakerism I want to smooth over these tender spots.

Sir Michael Cashin has said that the Government has prostituted some public departments, and I would like to jog his memory again, and remind him that he himself has been the greatest sinner in this respect, for he himself has prostituted government departments.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—What Department do you mean?

MR. HIBBS:—I mean first the Department of Public Works. In the spring of 1919 $500,000 was voted for repairs to the public works of this country, at that time we had just passed through a period of depression occasioned by the great War. We had had our backs to the wall for a long period when it took all our resources to support our forces, and help to carry on the struggle.

Our people were too patriotic to embarrass the Government or expect much money for any other purpose during that time, consequently, our roads, bridges, wharves and other public utilities were in a bad state. The wear and tear of years had rendered it necessary to vote a liberal sum for this laudable purpose. Consequently, most people looked forward with much pleasure to having all those improvements made, but Sir, when that half million was voted by the then National Government, I felt that the Union party would never participate in its expenditure. I expressed my belief to some of the Union Members at that time. I knew that there would be some scheme or manipulation to get rid of the Union members of the Government, so that the public funds belonging to the people of this country would be used to purchase their votes and influence the support of the electorate. And, Sir, events have since proven the correctness of my prediction.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Is that so? You are young in politics yet.

MR. HIBBS:—That is so, Sir Michael, and I could tell quite a story of how the betrayal took place, and that famous vote of want of confidence that you moved and that was seconded by the then Prime Minister, Sir Wm. Lloyd himself.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Tell the story if you like.

MR. HIBBS:—I don't think Sir Michael would like to hear that story

told here to-day, but I intend to tell it later on.

Mr. Speaker, "The Local Affairs Act" passed June, 1915, permitted the people to elect their own representatives on Boards to expend their money in the best possible manner.

The people generally elected the very best men on the Road Boards, zealous men; men who were competent and had some knowledge of road building. It is a well known fact that I did my best to establish a better road movement. I repeatedly interviewed the Minister of Public Works, but without any good effect. I was at that time Chairman of the elected Road Board with jurisdiction from Horse Cove to Indian Pond, about 20 miles, and excepting the Municipal Council here, this was the most important Board in the country. The main highway Topsail Road had to accommodate about 600 motor cars, and not being built for present day traffic t was torn to pieces.

We had quite a problem on our hands while the war was on. We didn't want to embarrass the Government, but when the $500,000 were voted I figured out that as we had about 3750 residents, on a per capita basis, we ought to get something over $7,000.00. We began to make plans for the expenditure of this amount. Probably every Road Board in Newfoundland was looking forward to this special grant. But I had a suspicion in the back of my head that everything would not go right, and that there was going to be some difficulty in getting the amount that should come to our section of the district. Events that have taken place since then have proved that my suspicion was not without foundation. The Minister of Public Works played his old game of politics, but he was not alone to blame. Every man who constituted that Government was to blame, and principally the Premier, now the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, Sir Michael Cashin. The money was held back. I tried to get some to repair bridges that had rotted away. Wharves were in a bad condition. I tried to complete a harbour under construction, but my efforts only represented time wasted. The expectation was Hibbs will soon be going to some district, and then I will spend the money. I went to Fogo, and two days after he went to Harbour Main district and threw our money around. At 6.30 Mr. Hibbs moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Speaker, at the time of the adjournment of the debate yesterday, I was making some observations on the prostitution of Public Departments by the late Government, and I would now like to continue. I had made special references to the Department of Public Works. I pointed out that the National Government allocated five hundred thousand dollars for the repairs and rebuilding of the Public Works throughout the country. This was badly needed, as I reminded the House last evening, we had passed through a period of five years, during which time very little constructive work was performed. It was the largest sum voted during recent years, and I will discuss this evening the manner in which this money was expended. I think that even the gentlemen on the other side of the House will agree that the money was spent in a most disgraceful and discreditable manner, for it must be admitted that at least three hundred thousand out of the five were thrown away to influence votes for the Government. Take the district of Hr. Main as an instance:

MR. MACDONNELL:—Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The Honourable member has no right to discuss a matter that is subjudice.

MR. HIBBS:—Mr. Speaker, I claim a perfect right to discuss the action of a public man in connection with public matters.

HON. THE SPEAKER:—I have heard the remarks of the Hon. member for Fogo, and nothing that he has said justifies me in calling him to order.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Speaker, I submit with all due respect to your ruling that this is not a matter that should be discussed here while it is before the courts.

HON. MINISTER MARINE & FISHERIES:—Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out that a member of this House is responsible only to this Assembly for his words. This House is superior even to the courts.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Speaker, I would like to have your ruling as to whether a member who is duly elected can take his seat while under legal inquiry.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Speaker, I agree with the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The subject cannot be debarred from discussion in this House, and a member is responsible only to this House for any statement he may make while addressing the chair. Therefore, if Mr. Hibbs is not out of order, he has a right to proceed.

MR. HIBBS:—Mr. Speaker, I repeat that public money was thrown away. Did not witnesses come in and swear that they received money for which they gave no returns That is public information, it has been published in the newspapers and sent broadcast throughout the land, it is no secret I'm divulging.

MR. HIGGINS:—I know the whole story of that and will tell it later.

MR. HIBBS:—Must I accept your words as a threat or an insinuation that I am connected improperly in this matter?

MR. HIGGINS:—No, I did not say that.

MR. HIBBS:—The Local Affairs Act took the expenditure of public monies out of the hands of the politicians and vested that power in the common people, thro' the Eelective Road Board. That is the most democratic Act on our Statute Book. As a matter of fact the manner in which public monies were spent in the past was anything but right, in most cases it was spent to catch votes, and in all cases it was the return of the Party and not the return in labor that was considered. For that reason when the Union Party was returned to the House in 1913 this Act was passed, and they were instrumental in having the measure enacted, and I must give the Government under the leadership of Sir Edward Morris, now Lord Morris, the credit of supporting it.

Under the Act the people of every locality are empowered to elect their best men to serve on the Road Boards, where formerly the politician or member for the District would select them, and generally they were heelers of that candidate. Very often then we found incompetent men on the Boards, the only qualification necessary was to be an intimate friend of the Candidate, and this is not always the best type of man. But under the present system the men are invited to come to a public meeting, and to vote for the men of their choice to represent their settlement on the Road Board.

I don't think that I am infringing on the scope of this subject when I say that men who had no legal authority whatever have secured public money and thrown it away as if it had no value. What was done in Hr. Main was done to a greater or lesser degree all over the country. Was this fair? Was it honest? Was it right to ignore the voice of the people, and the men whom they had elected to spend public money in favor of irresponsibles who had no authority whatever?

Now sir, I want to make a reference to my own District. The District of Fogo affords a good example of what was done with public funds throughout the North. We have a population down there of something over 8000, and on a per capita basis, we should have received between $16,000 and $17,000. Mr. Oake was Sir Michael Cashin's candidate, and he also ignored the Road Boards as much as he dared. He spent or gave away in Fogo District about $5,000, so that we have about $11,000 due us yet. This money was spent somewhere else, and I hold the Leader of the Opposition responsible for it.

My honorable friend, the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, who so ably represented the District of Fogo at the time, asked repeatedly for the Districts share of this money, but to no avail.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—And he got his share, too.

MR. HIBBS:—He did not get the District's share of the special grant of $500,000; part of that was given to Mr. Oake and the balance sent to other Districts that had no right to it

Was this square dealing? Was this an honest, manly way to handle public monies? Was it playing the game squarely and above Board, Sir Michael? It was virtually robbing the people of Fogo District, and if there is one District in Newfoundland that need money and deserve money, it is the District of Fogo.

This was not playing the game squarely by the people of this country.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—You have a lot to learn yet.

MR. HIBBS:—I may be young in politics, but one of the things I do not wish to become is a professional politician. He is about the worse type of man I know in Newfoundland. However, I have learned enough to know right from wrong, and when you take a dry goods clerk out of a shop and send him to a District like Fogo to try and win an election in the manner I have referred to, I know that it is not playing the game, and the same thing applies to Twillingate and other Northern Districts. What is the nett result of all this? This Government, by Proclamation, will give every District in the country power to elect Road Boards, but can we expect those men in the light of what has been done, to be honest and take an interest in the duties devolving upon them, when their neighbors can go around bragging that "I got fifty dollars, and did nothing for it," or "I got a hundred dollars without striking a tap for it." That's the example that has been set, and I assure you the consequences will be felt; you have undermined all that goes to make a man straight, and honest in the handling of public monies.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to refer honorable gentlemen to section 50 of the Local Affairs Act, and I want to ask my legal friends opposite who are so ready at rising to points of order what legal interpretation is to be placed upon it.

That section reads:

50.—The Governor in Council shall, by warrant on the public treasury of the Colony, pay over to the Boards, on the first days of October and April in each year, the one-half of the following annual votes and grants properly allotable to the area over which the said Boards exercise jurisdiction, viz.:—

(a) The grant or grants for the maintenance, construction and repairs of roads, streets, bridges and breakwaters;

(b) Any other sums of money voted

for general public improvements.

I claim, Mr. Speaker, that under this section no member has any more right to go into a District or into any section of the country that is under the jurisdiction of a Road Board and distribute monies for public works in disregard of these Road Boards than any one of the Honorable members for St. John's East has to send a gang of men down to work on Duckworth Street without the permission of the Municipal Council. If that happened, someone would be before the Court the next day, but because these districts are in the Outports they think that they can go there and do as they please. I have heard it said that this Act was so framed that you could drive a horse and car thro' it, and I sometimes wonder if such loopholes were left purposely by the legal gentlemen who a hand in framing it. I could deal more extensively with this matter, but I do not wish to take up too much of the time of this House. I could point out many cases of corruption and prostitution of public monies were it necessary for me to do so. The result of all this, Mr. Speaker, is that now we have people asking for money for services that really need attention, and on which these monies that were flagrantly squandered should have been spent. I trust that Dr. Jones, who I know will represent the District of Hr. Main ably, will see that the public monies are better expended in that District in future.

And now, sir, a word as to the Fish regulations.

Some of the gentlemen opposite are anxious to convince the House that they fought a clean campaign last Fall, and that they were all a bunch of "Simon Pure's," but I would like to remind them that they have been playing politics with the country's greatest asset, the Fishing industry, even during the General Election. Some of the Hon. members have admitted that they learned more about the regulations since the "House" opened than ever before, and in all probability that is true, but it is a pity that as public men they did not try to discover some real facts regarding the measure while the by-election was on in St. John's West.

Then the situation was deliberately misrepresented, and we heard all kinds of abuse of Mr. Coaker and the regulations.

While the campaign was on, and before, all kinds of insulting slogans and catch cries were circulated from the newspapers and platforms, and even now I imagine I can hear the catch cry of "Mad Mullah of the North" or the "Menace of Coakerism," or something else equally deceptive and insulting.

I think an apology is due the Hon. Minister of Marine & Fisheries for the manner in which he has been attacked.

My Hon. friend, the member for Ferryland, Mr. Moore, saw fit to make some very uncomplimentary references to certain gentlemen who occupy positions in this House, men who in their position were defenceless. Now, sir, I question the propriety of such a proceeding, and I must say that I did not consider it at all manly or proper. We are all human and no man likes to sit quietly while an attack is being made upon him to which he cannot reply.

I may as well name these gentlemen as Mr. Moore did. They were Mr. Carter, Mr. Winter and Mr. Barron and others, and Mr. Moore tried to point out that these gentlemen were not as patriotic as they should have been. He made allusions hat might easily be misconstrued. Now, Sir, when one hears a man talking like that, you are

almost inclined to believe that he means what he is saying and has shown a good example himself and I would ask permission to point out a little of the patriotic activity of this gentleman which was so freely displayed by him while the Great War was on. I do not so much judge a man by his words as by his deeds.

Act Number One

On looking up the records I find one transaction where a Boiler known as the Leonard Steam Efficiency Boiler invoiced at $650.00 was brought in by Moore & Co., and entered free of duty. Allowing an estimated freight rate of say $120 this would bring up the cost of landing this boiler to $770.00. For the information of the public I might say that this Boiler was sold to Mr. W. Woodford, Minister of Public Works, to be installed in a public institution for $1,675.00, showing a neat little profit of $905.00 on this boiler, assuming that the freight rate is correct. I also find that my Hon. friend was in receipt of some favours from the Minister of Finance, Sir Michael Cashin This is only natural, I suppose, seeing that he was a colleague of his. During the years 1917, 1918 and 1919 no less than 33 entries were passed for goods amounting to $14,000.00 imported by Moore and Co., and signed by Sir Michael Cashin himself.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Certainly, there was over $4,000,000 worth entered Duty free last year.

.MR. HIBBS:—I am prepared to admit that it is possible that the goods were intended for public institutions.

MR. MOORE:—Yes, and churches.

MR. HIBBS:—Yes, and were for that reason permitted free Entry, but nevertheless I am curious to know if the purchaser received the advantage of the Rebate. Another curious fact I have noticed on inquiry, that several of those Entries and Invoices have been removed from the records. I do not say that this has been done for a dishonest purpose, I merely make this remark in passing. Now, Mr. Speaker, this Hon. gentleman who has pointed out several men as not deserving of positions in this House, has made a great mistake in throwing stones at other persons while living in a glass house himself I may also state, Sir, that during the past two and a half years this same Hon. gentleman has received from the Public Treasury no less sum than $93,683.00. He would no doubt have received a considerable amount over this if his contracts had not been cancelled by the present Government and it is quite obvious that it is this cancellation business which has made him so sore and disappointed. I also find, Mr. Speaker, that another gentleman very closely acquainted with the members on the other side of the House had received money covering contracts to the amount of $251,-$50.00. The gentleman I refer now to the Hon. W. J. Ellis.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—That money was on account of work on the Lunatic Asylum and other institutions. Did you expect him to do this work as a charity?

MR. HIBBS:—Not at all, Sir, I merely want to show how you looked after your political friends to the ex clusion of others.

Another gentleman who received considerable favours at the hands of our friends opposite was Mr. Jesse Whiteway, who received from the Board of Works Department alone $83,411.00.

My Hon. friend, Mr. Bennett thinks that returned veterans who appealed to a constituency should not have their seats contested Well now, I admit that would be a graceful act, but I wonder why you didn't think of that when you sent Mr. Whiteway over in Bay de Verde district to oppose Sergt. Major LeGrow, and I also wonder if

this liberal patronage had anything to do with the resignation of Mr. Whiteway's seat in the Upper House so that he might be free to contest that district.

The firm of M. & E. Kennedy also received a nice little slice in the form of $106,609.00.

There is still another man with whom no doubt our friends are familiar, Mr. James Spratt. He received $33,775.00. In the general and bye-elections he was very conspicuous and it is not at all surprising when you consider that he had received such fat contracts and there was a great possibility of his losing them.

We may now take McGrath Bros They were also very active in the last election, and I don't blame them either. They received several thous and for painting institutions, which contracts, of course, they did not want to lose.

Mr. F. McNamara is one of the honorable gentlemen who supports the Leader of the Opposition in the Upper House. He received $3,640.00, a nice little sum, but still he must be feeling sore by this time that he did not get more when he had the chance.

And now I come to an old and genial friend of mine, and I am glad he got something. I would not like to hear that he did not get anything. He is smiling over there near the curtain. Mr. N. J. Vinicombe is listed as having received $8,062.90, and that was, I presume, when he was a prospective candidate for St. John's East. Now, Sir, if, as my friends on the Opposition charge me with, I am a little suspicious, you can hardly blame me, for I heard a lot from Sir Michael Cashin the other day on profiteers and profiteering, and he attempted to move an amendment, deploring that no mention of dealing with profiteering was included in the Speech from the Throne. He tried to make us believe he was sincere. Really he looked sincere, but now I want to ask him to define what he calls profiteering. In his zeal for the people of the country he talked five hours, and his address, while interesting and instructive, contained some remarks that I want to question.

I find that Mr. Jesse Whiteway was commissioned to supply some gauze, or cheese cloth, to the hospital. I find that in 1918 and 1919 he paid for this gauze as per invoices the sum of £791.7.0. If you were to make this up at $4.86 to the Pound, you would find that it comes to $3.489.66. This gauze was allowed to come in duty free, and rightly so. We must assume he paid a nominal freight charge. He sold this gauze to the Government for $6.931.90, making on that deal a profit of approximately $3.000. Was that an excessive profit? Would you call that profiteering? Sir Michael, and that's why I am suprised, if that went on with your knowledge, at your coming here and telling us you are sorry there is no legislation to deal with profiteering. Now, is that consistent? Is that the kind of consistency you were going to practise? If so, I am glad that you are on the Opposition side of the House, and not only that, but we are going to keep you there.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—In justice to Mr. Whiteway I might say that he bought a considerable amount of such material locally, that may be included in that bill.

MR. HIBBS:—This is the amount covered by his invoices at the Customs.

Hon. W. J. Ellis is another case that resembles profiteering. I am glad he is now recovering from his recent illness, and only that I know he is convalescent I would not refer to this matter. He supplied material for the Empire Barracks and charged and

was paid for 201,366 feet of lumber. Now, this was an extraordinary quality of lumber. It possessed some strange kind of vanishing disposition, because we find that when the Superintendent of Public Works attempted to enumerate the quantity used in the building, and allowing 40% waste, which would indeed be excessive, all that could be accounted for was 146,216 feet; over 60,000 feet seems to have entirely disappeared. I think it will take us the next two years to investigate matters of this kind.

LIEUT.-COL. SULLIVAN:—Tell us the prices charged for it.

MR. HIBBS:—I am coming to that now. At the time this lumber was supplied, the market prices for rough spruce board were from $37.00 to $40 per thousand. Mr. Ellis charged and was paid $50.00 to $60.00 per thousand. The market price for match board was $40 to $50 a thousand. Mr. Ellis received from $50 to $75 a thousand. Was that profiteering? I merely point out these things to see if you are consistent and I ask if these things were done with your knowledge. If so, how can you justify it?

And now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to take Sir Michael Cashin to task for getting after members for doing that which he himself has done. When I was sitting here the other day I heard him accusing the Hon. Mr. Coaker and the Prime Minister of having quarreled, and when it came to election time of shaking hands over the matter. Now, I want to remind him that it is very dangerous to bring up things of this nature. If we were to probe into the political history of the past 25 years we would find that many strange things have been said and done. I don't think it is good grace on Sir Michael's part to find fault with and attack the Prime Minister and the Minister of Marine & Fisheries because they have forgotten their past differences, and let by-gones be by-gones, and come together to do something for this country. I would remind the Hon gentleman that he too has had unkind things said of him by men whom he afterwards forgave and became very closely associated with. I Would ask Sir Michael if he knows or remembers such a man as Alfred B. Morine.

I have a singular remembrance of a certain incident that happened in the House.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of Order. This man cannot quote past proceedings, or lay it before the House for the consideration of the House in the manner he is doing.

HON. THE SPEAKER:—While I have the honour to occupy this seat the same liberty that I accorded to the men on my right will surely be accorded to those on my left. I shall endeavour to observe the points of order, but if the points are not raised properly I shall have to keep to what the authority of the Rules of the House provides.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether I can draw from your remarks that I have elicited any censure. But with all due respect I wish to point out that my point was well taken and to add that even if the Chair was prepared to relax the rules heretofore that that is no answer to what is happening at the present moment. I direct the attention of the Chair to the violation of the Rules of the House perpetrated by the Hon. Member for Fogo. He has no right to quote in the manner in which he is doing, or to lay before the Chair anything that transpired in the past.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—May I ask how it was that Sir Michael Cashin was allowed

to quote the other night my remarks in connection with the Hon. Mr. Squires.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to say that we are altogether apart from the question. What happened the other night has nothing to do with now.

MR. HIBBS:—Mr. Speaker, apparently it all depends on whose ox is gored. I am disagreeably surprised to find out that the Hon. member for St. John's East is falling from grace so soon. He made a splendid speech the other night and I was delighted to congratulate him. But, now I find him sitting there and listening to Sir Michael Cashin quoting previous proceedings of this House, as it referred to the Prime Minister and the Hon. Mr. Coaker, without turning a hair, but just as soon as I attempt to quote references to Sir Michael then the Hon. gentleman discovers I am out of order.

If it was right for his honoured leader to quote those references. surely in all fairness, it is equally right for me. If the Hon. Member, Mr. Fox is unbiassed, and stands on principle, why did you not remind the Chair that the Leader of the Opposition was out of order.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Speaker, I rise to another point of order. The Hon. Member for Fogo has no right to address a private individual in this House, He should address himself to you and not to me.

MR. HIBBS:—Mr. Speaker, I was going on to say when I was interrupted, that Mr. A. B. Morine on the occasion referred to, in addressing the then Hon. Mr. Cashin, used the following words: "Is there a law of God or man that you have not broken; if you received your just deserts you would be behind four stone walls. And yet, Sir Michael Cashin not only forgave him but he took that man Morine into his Cabinet last year, and gave him the portfolio of Minister of Justice. If Sir Michael Cashin could do that with Mr. Morine how can he consistently claim that it was wrong for the Hons. Messrs. Coaker and Squires to forget their past differences?

Now, Sir, I think I have delayed the House quite long enough. Before taking my seat, however, I would like to have a certain matter set right. We often make mistakes and this is an instance.

Up to the time when we heard the statement from the lips of the hon. member for St. John's East, Mr. Higgins, that he was no longer a solicitor for the Reid Nfld. Co., I was inclined to doubt the statement in the press. In order to remove misunderstanding I would advise him to take the earliest opportunity of looking through the International Law Directory, which carries an advertisement that the firm of Higgins & Hunt are solicitors for the Reid Company, and have same corrected to avoid misunderstanding. I wish to say that I accept the hon. gentleman's statement that he is not Reid's solicitor, and I direct his attention to this in a friendly spirit, because it is in direct conflict with the statement of the hon. member in this House.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Speaker, this has gone far enough. With all due respect to the Chair, the hon. member for Fogo has been extended such latitude that should not be extended him; an extension that has led to such a flagrant abuse of the rules of the House as we have just witnessed.

MR. HIGGINS:—'Tis getting like a rehearsal for a concert or a Kelligrews soiree.

MR. HIBBS:—You evidently do not want to hear this. Why is it that the law firm of Higgins & Hunt are stated in a reputable law journal to be the solicitors of the Reid Company

when you come here and say you are not?

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Speaker, I think it is clearly a case of personal privilege to rise to a point of order. The Hon. Member has undertaken to get himself into trouble. There is always a way to teach people even if desperate methods have to be employed. Referring to the International Law Directory for 1920 which he produces. As a professional man I take it that the man has no knowledge of the land in which he is wandering when he comes in here and endeavours to spring something extraordinary on this House. What the point is I do not know. Apparently, there is some remarkable thing about my history or how I get my living. He produces a book with an "AD" in it stating that we are Solicitors for the Consolidated Foundry, I do not know that we are. I think Mr. Conroy was the Solicitor for that Company. That we are Solicitors for the Reid Newfoundland Co. We certainly are not. That we are Solicitors for the Imperial Tobacco Co. We are, and the Canada Permanent Mortgage Corporation is not now in existence; also that we correspond in English and French. As a matter of fact we correspond badly in English and I am afraid not at all in French. What our cable address and other things are mentioned also. As I take it the object of the Hon. Gentleman in discussing my private affairs is to suggest that what I told, namely, that I was not the Solicitor for the Reid Company, was an untruth. If the Hon. Gentleman tries to question that statement further in any shape or form, I shall have to ask for a Committee of Privilege to censure him. I think it is indecent and disrespectful for any Member of this House to come along and act the scapegoat or the instrument for someone else. I say that the Hon. Member for Fogo displayed a little lack of thought this afternoon.

MR. HIBBS:—Mr. Speaker, I want to serve notice on the hon. member for St. John's East, that while I am sitting on this side of the House and he on that side I am not going to allow him to bulldose me or talk to me again as he has this afternoon. If he thinks he can do it, well then he never made a bigger mistake in his life. He may be allowed plenty of latitude in other places to camouflage, but he cannot do it here, and the sooner he understands that the better. If I touched a tender spot while dealing with a matter of public concern, he will only have to take his medicine, and I may have to give him more of it before I finish. I hope I have too much pride and sense to allow any man to speak of me like that.

MR. McDONNELL:—You must hold a great opinion of yourself.

MR. HIBBS:—In view of recent events I hope the member for St. George's does not hold as high an opinion of himself. It is Sir the height of impertinence. Is it because the hon. member for St. John's East happen to be a lawyer that one can't refer to him. What is all the row about? What has been said to raise so many members' ire? I have not started to talk at all yet. I am only playing with them. I cannot say what will happen when I do get started. If the hon. member for St. John's East makes a statement that he is not the solicitor for the Reid Nfld. Co., I accept it, but if to-morrow he advertises in a daily paper that he is, surely Mr. Speaker I can comment upon it.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. This is not an explanation Sir, I want to have the proper thing done. And when a man in here discusses a man's private business he will hear from me. Does he mean to say that I am lying?

MR. HIBBS:—I said at the beginning that I accepted the hon. gentleman's statement. But when he says that he is not the solicitor for a Government contractor, and an advertisement from his firm says he is than it is a matter for public discussion, and any remarks I make I will not take back, not for any man. And I wish to call his attention to that fact.

MR. HIGGINS:—When the matter comes around again you will hear from me.

MR. HIBBS:—The hon. gentleman is welcome to say all he likes. I will take my seat and give him an opportunity to say all he has to say on the point, and he will find that the gentlemen this side of the House will take their medicine without interrupting and calling the attention of the Speaker to imaginary points of order . If my remarks trouble any person, well, I cannot help it. The question under discussion is a public one and I cannot do more for the hon. member for St. John's East than accept the statement he makes. If any differences arise between us I hope I shall have an opportunity to discuss them fairly with him, but I make no apologies for anything I have said.

In conclusion, I hope to have the pleasure of seeing the Hon. Leader of the Opposition returned to this Chamber for many years to come, and that I will be here to view him occupying his seat on that side of the House.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, April 29, 1920.

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

MR. SMALL:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Cape LaHune and the people of Petites for the erection of a telegraph station at those places. Cape LaHune has a population of 400 people and Petites a population of 250. This petition is signed by every man in these settlements and I strongly support it and trust that the department will give it its due consideration.

MR. TARGETT:—I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Old Perlican asking for a sum of money to repair the public wharf at that place. The wharf is now in a very bad condition and I think it would be a great pity to let it fall into total decay. It would be far cheaper to spend a small sum of money on it now and save further expense in the future. I hope the department will see its way clear to grant this allocation.

MR. GUPPY:—I rise to support the prayer of the petition presented by Mr. Targett.

MR. CHEESEMAN:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the inhabitants of Point aux Gaul on the subject of telephone extension. They ask that Point au Gaul be connected with Lamaline by telephone. It is a very important fishing settlement, about three miles distant from Lamaline and the residents have to go to Lamaline to conduct practically all their business. Lamaline is not considered a safe harbor for steamers, consequently people have to wait there for three or four days to take passage by a coastal steamer, whereas if they had a telephone service people could remain at home and save considerable time and expense. I trust that this petition will be referred to the department to which it relates and receive earnest consideration.

HON. MR. FOOTE:—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the

prayer of the petition. The people of Point aux Gaul are an industrious and thrifty people and any facility that this Government can provide for them will be appreciated; besides it would mean a great benefit for the country generally; and any facility given to the class of people mentioned will amply repay the Colony.

MR. SMALL:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Burgeo asking that a fog alarm be erected on Bore Island; also that a gas buoy be put at the entrance to Burgeo Harbor. The petition reads as follows and speaks for itself.

I might say that this petition is signed by 210 of the best fishermen of the country and it is also signed by captains Connors and Blandford, of the steamers Portia and Glencoe, respectively. We have had in the past lots of wrecks accompanied by loss of life, around Burgeo owing to not having a whistle at Bore Island. Fog is very prevalent there and coastal steamers at night time have to lie off between Burgeo and Ramea. It would be an easy matter to erect this at Bore Island by providing an assistant with the lighthouse keeper. I trust that the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries will take this matter up and give it the most careful consideration.

Mr. Sullivan asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary who in the absence of a Minister of Militia is responsible for the Militia Department.

1.—To inform this House how or in what manner confidential documents in the custody of the Militia Department relating to returned soldiers 2583 Michael Doran, Martin Tracey and Pte. Milley, came into the possession of **The St. John's Daily Star** and were published in that paper on March 12th, 1920;

2.—And to inform this House if any enquiry has been or will be held into this regrettable breach of confidence on the part of some person in the Department of Militia;

3.—And if he is aware that the only legitimate use an officer or a soldier may make of documents or information of which he becomes possessed in his official capacity is for the furtherance of the public service in the performance of his duty, and that the publishing of official documents or information or using them for personal controversy, or for any private purpose, without due authority will be treated as a breach of the official secrets act, 1911;

4.—And also to ask him as head of the Militia Department if he is aware that the company conduct sheet of a soldier is to be destroyed on his discharge.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I beg to reply to the questions of Mr. Sullivan re Militia Department as follows:

1.—To inform this House how or in what manner confidential documents in the custody of the Militia Department relating to returned soldiers 2587 Michael Doran, 8253 Martin Tracey, and 2583 Private Milley, came into the possession of the **St. John's Daily Star,** and were published in that paper on March 12th, 1920.

No confidential documents in the custody of the Militia Department relating to any returned soldier came at any time into the possesion of **The St. John's Daily Star,** nor were such published in that paper or in any other newspaper on March 12th, or any other date.

2.—And to inform this House if any enquiry has been or will be held into this regrettable breach of confidence on the part of some person in the Department of Militia.

Answer covered by the reply to No. 1

3.—And if he is aware that the only legitimate use an officer or a soldier may make of documents or informa-

tion of which he becomes possessed in his official capacity is for the furtherance of the public service in the performance of his duty, and that the publishing of official documents or information or using them for personal controversy, or for any private purpose, without due authority, will be treated as a breach of the official secrets Act, 1917.

This question is practically a quotation of a part of paragraph 1860 of the King's Regulations and Orders for the Army, issue of 1912. This paragraph comes under the heading of "Documents and Maps marked Secret, Confidential or for Office Use Only." The entire paragraph 1860 reads as follows:

"Documents and maps classed as 'secret' or 'confidential' are not to be referred to in any catalogue or publication which is not itself a document marked 'secret' or 'confidential' as the case may be. The only legitimate use an officer or soldier may make of documents or information of which he becomes possessed in his official capacity is for the furtherance of the public service in the performance of his duty. Publishing official documents or information or using them for personal controversy, or for any private purpose, without due authority, will be treated as a breach of official trust under the Official Secrets Act, 1911."

In so far as Mr. Sullivan's question, No. 3, consists of an exact quotation from Rule 1860 above quoted, it is correct army law.

4.—And also to ask him as head of the Militia Department if he is aware that the company conduct sheet of a soldier is to be destroyed on his discharge.

In the case of imperial soldiers, two conduct sheets are kept for each soldier, a regimental conduct sheet and a company conduct sheet. The regimental conduct sheet is the permanent document, and is compiled from the company conduct sheet. As the compilation proceeds the company conduct sheets are destroyed, this being done at definite periods. The company conduct sheet contains the details of the soldiers conduct, giving the exact date and particulars of every military offence. The imperial authorities do not keep a permanent record of all these details; they keep a summary only. Consequently the company conduct sheet, when summarised and its contents transferred to the regimental conduct sheet, is destroyed, the King's Regulations providing that before the company conduct sheets are destroyed the entries in the regimental sheets will be checked and completed. As an illustration—take the case of a soldier who had a record of being drunk on five occasions. The company conduct sheet would give the exact date and particulars of each case of drunkenness, while the regimental conduct sheet would merely indicate as a summary that that particular soldier had been drunk on five occasions within a specific period of time, but would not give the day of the month or the details of the occurrences. My honorable friend will be able to secure full information in all these particulars by reference to the King's Regulations already referred to. In the case of the Newfoundland Regiment the considerable trouble and expense of taking each soldier's company conduct sheet and digesting it for the purposes of having a permanent digested record of the soldier's career in the form of a regimental conduct sheet was not adopted, the company conduct sheets being kept, instead of the department going to the trouble and expense of having the soldier's record gone over in each case and specially summarised for a permanent regimental record. So that my hon. friend may have an opportunity of further studying the question in which he appears to be interested, I would refer him to the

King's Regulations, paragraph 1919, under the head of "Regimental Conduct Sheets," where he will find that the regimental conduct sheets of non-commissioned officers of the rank of colour-sergeant and upwards will be kept as confidential documents.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Mr. Speaker, I should like to make one or two observations with reference to this, with all due deference to the replies of the Prime Minister. Our Prime Minister is a lawyer, but I contend that these documents are confidential and soldiers who were on the other side know that conduct sheets over there were strictly private. Let me cite a case of divorce proceedings that were in court in England last year. Evidence was required by a lady to prove that her husband had contracted venereal disease in France, and an attempt was made to secure from the authorities evidence to prove this fact. But so strictly are the regulations carried out over there that nothing could be divulged; an appeal was made to the War Office, but also without avail. I contend that the documents referred to are of a confidential nature and that the information used by **The Daily Star** newspaper must have been obtained by someone connected with the Militia Department. It is stated explicitly in the King's regulations that even if the documents are not marked private, that they are official documents and cannot be used in controversy or in private.

I again contend that they were used for political purposes, and before this session closes I intend to go more fully into this matter. There has been a leakage somewhere and men who are friends of the Royal Newfoundland Regiment are going to insist and find out how that leakage occurred.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question on the Order paper of yesterday in connection with the Finance Department I wish to draw the attention of the House to the answer given by the minister to the question asked by my honorable colleague, Mr. Moore, for the number of officials dismissed from the department during the last six months. I see Mr. John Brazil has been dismissed for no services performed. I would like to point out to the House that Mr. Brazil has been in the service of the department for the last nine years. He was tidewaiter on the Fiona and several revenue cutters around the Island. He is a first class officer and there was no mark against him during my term of office. He belongs to Renews. He was promptly dismissed when the new government got in power mainly because he was a supporter of mine. I do not know whether he was and I do not care. There was no charge against this man up to the time I left the department. He was a first class officer and I got proof of that right here. It comes from a man who is recognized all over the country and who has been one of the best civil service officials Newfoundland has had. This gentleman is Inspector O'Reilly. (Reads recommendation.) I also have another certificate here and will read it. (Reads certificate signed by J. H. Dee, Inspector.) As I already pointed out he belongs to Renews and has a big family and was solely dependent on this monthly salary. From the department he received this dated January 28th, 1920. (Reads dismissal notice). I would like to draw the attention of the House to this case especially. The man who has dismissed this man has power from the Government to do anything appertaining to my district, and he was paid to run against me in Ferryland District in the general elections. But he did not save his nomination fee. The people of the district have been insulted, because a man who was paid to run against me but who was not able to

save his nomination fee can dismiss officials as in this case. This defeated candidate has been handed over the District of Ferryland by the Government of the day to control as he wishes, and to appoint people to the various positions. This man is dismissed because he supoprted me. I will say right here that if this state of things is going to exist I am going to make things hot for the present Government of the day. None of this was done in Sir Edward Morris' time, Sir Wm. Whiteway's, or Sir Robert Bond's, none of it. This action reveals a debased contemptible mind.

MR. MOORE:—I want to say that Mr. Hibbs is not correct in what he says about that boiler. My bill covers not alone the actual cost of the boiler but also that o finstalling it as well.

MR. ARCHIBALD:—Mr. Speaker, as I rise to address this House for the first time I am mindful of the fact that I am in the presence of hon. members on both sides of ten to thirty years experience, and I do so with a certain timidity, not being an experienced speaker; but, however, the oldest hon. member had to make a beginning.

First, Mr. Speaker, I do heartily congratulate you upon the office you have attained as First Commoner of the land. I am proud of your attainment for several reasons, Sir, one of which is that you are a full blooded fisherman of the old stock. The whole country ought to be proud, Sir, as we are a fishing people and it is time that a fisherman should fill that chair. I am sure, Sir, that you will conduct its business without fear or favor to any hon. member of this House, and I feel confident that you will do credit to yourself and country.

I also congratulate Lieut. Smail and Sergt. Major LeGrow on the able manner in which they delivered their address in moving the reply to the Speech from the Throne. I am sure Sir, that all the hon. members will join with me in extending to them a real royal welcome and that at all times the hon. members of both sides of this House will show them that courtesy due them for their heroism and that special respect in which they are held by the people as Blue Puttee men. I am sure, Sir, judging from their first speeches, that the soldiers of this old land of ours have nothing to fear; the Regiment has in them men that can state their case well and at all times and get their rights.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I pass on to say that my appearance in this House as a public man is not of my own seeking as I made a strong effort to keep out of the field, having been brought out in two public meetings at Harbor Grace. I am only here, Mr. Speaker, because of the confidence placed in me by the fishermen and working men of Harbor Grace District. When I saw this body of people with such confidence I could not help coming, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that with all my short-comings I will measure to some small extent up to their expectations.

Now that I have made clear the reason of my appearance, I want to clearly state to the hon. members of this House that I have one object and one only, namely, the betterment of the whole people, especially that of the fishermen and workingmen, to endeavour to create conditions that will make them more prosperous. Mr. Speaker, the cost of living today is tremendous, the remedy for this will need the honest effort of every man and especially that of hon. members of this House and leaders in every walk of life.

It is the especial duty of hon. members of the Government to conduct its affairs in such an honest and efficient manner that the people will

reap the benefits. Honest administration is the only thing that will save this country and eventually will be the means of reducing taxation and increasing the earning powers of the people. I feel sure, Sir, that the Government will look immediately into profiteering and stop it; we owe it to the people.

Mr. Speaker, we are not holding seats in this House as private individuals (as the hon. member of St. George's, Mr. Macdonnell, who being elected by the people on the Liberal Reform ticket took it upon himself to place his District in opposition without their consent), but we hold them as a trust from the people. They are their seats and not ours. Therefore, Sir, we must at all times use the public eyes and make all our laws to help them and also put our foot immediately down upon anything that hurts them. I hope that I shall never treat my seat in the People's House as though it were Archibald's; it is not. I wish to take this opportunity to tell the general public that I regard it as a sacred trust and will treat it as such.

Mr. Speaker, our campaign in the District of Harbor Grace was fought clean. We spoke along democratic lines and did not use any abuse of our opponents. We criticised the actions and policy of the then Government, which was our duty; but, Sir, I will challenge any person in or out of the District of Harbor Grace to say that we talked any dirt, sectarian or otherwise. In the face of that, Sir, I noticed in the editorial column of The Evening Herald of January 3rd, 1920, of which the hon. member of St. George's, Mr. MacDonnell, was then acting editor, a veiled hint as follows: "The report that Mr. Archibald at Harbor Grace held a set of Roman Catholic prayer beads in one hand and an orange in the other asking his audience which would they accept." Now, Sir, this remark was evidently calculated to circulate a false story or it was a deliberate invention on the part of the editor. This advertised my name throughout the length and breadth of this country and perhaps further as a type of character which I most strenuously abhor. I must take this opportunity of stating to the public through the Reporters' Box that this oblique insinuation is an absolutely deliberate falsehood on the part of the inventor. I take this to be an insult not only to me, but to the whole District of Harbor Grace which elected me by such an overwhelming majority. This insult falls upon both Catholics and Protestants of Harbor Grace District and especially upon the Orangemen who constitute by far the largest voting force of the District.

I want to point out to the hon. member, Mr. MacDonnell, that the people of our district are of a class who would be the first to condemn a candidate who attempted to use such despicable tactics to gain an election.

The Opposition have introduced into this House a discussion of sectarianism, and in reply I would touch on what I consider the real history of it. The Hon. the Leader of the Opposition Sir Michael Cashin, and the hon. member of St. John's East, Mr. Higgins, say that this is the best place to have free discussion and wash our dirty linen. I agree with them that in this House is the place and not on the street. I also agree most heartily with hon. members of the Opposition that this sectarian division is a most deplorable state of affairs and one that all fair-minded people are opposed to.

I will go on to show that this division has been set up by the Catholic people themselves.

A large body of people look upon politics as a game and this game has landed us in a sorry plight politically.

Mr. Speaker, I do not altogether blame the papers, although they are pretty bad and hardly fit to read. I do not think that this is the real source of the trouble. I have traced this back to the time of the deadlock. When Sir Robert Bond failed to appoint a Speaker, His Excellency the Governor called upon Sir Edward Morris, a Catholic leader, to form a Government. He managed it and came to the country. At the time of the deadlock, for instance, Placentia was with Bond, but at the next election which was but a short while after, they completely summersaulted. What happened I am not prepared to say, but it looked funny. The result of that election was that all the Catholic seats were on Sir Edward Morris' side, except two, the present Mr. Justice Kent and Mr. Dwyer, with a good share of Protestants. That was alright; we heard nothing whatever about it. Four years after we had another election, and the same thing happened. We still heard nothing about it. The present election came on, and again the same thing happened; but this time with only two Protestants.

As a consequence of the repetition of these tactics, it appears that the Protestants learned the lesson and quietly united. The most unfortunate thing about this, Sir, is that the game was carried too far, and now the Protestants have been shown their power and have had a decided victory. The psychological effect of this is that a victory once won will not be easily given up, even though all newspaper agitation ceases. The people to blame for this are those politicians who have looked upon politics as a game. It can be no longer looked upon as a game for then the Catholic people will be in opposition for the rest of their lives. But as it is, Mr. Speaker, I venture to risk an opinion and that is that the next time the Catholics will have to vote with the Protestants if they want to be in power. If they do that, then the next election which will be eight years from now, will likely find the whole people mixed as they used and should be.

When we come to the question of fisheries we arrive at the very life and pulse of the country. At the present juncture and for some time past a new departure has been absolutely necessary and no government has had the courage to tackle it till now. The country is very fortunate in having as Minister of Marine and Fisheries a man of ability, strength of character and sincerity of purpose sufficient to cope with the many and great difficulties of the situation. And I am sure that after hearing the speech of the Hon. Mr. Coaker, which has been conceded to be a master stroke even by many outspoken opponents of the Regulations, we must be convinced that the public confidence has not been misplaced. It is very pleasing indeed to note that the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition, Sir Michael Cashin, in rising to compliment the Minister, stated that if this policy outlined was followed, he would bespeak the unanimous support of the Opposition.

This must be of great satisfaction to the Hon. Mr. Coaker coming as it does from such an experienced man in the country's trade. It is hopeful to note this spirit in the Opposition, for by the united action of the fishermen, Trade, Opposition and Government, a complete and practical policy can be worked out, which will bestow a great blessing on not only one class, but the whole population of the country. Better days are dawning for this little Colony if the whole people can only forget politics, prejudice and selfish individual gain to work together to carry this difficult and exceedingly im-

portant national question to a successful solution.

I will not detain the House, Sir, any further by going into the details which have been dealt with so ably by the Minister and other Hon. Members, and which will be discussed fully when in committee.

MR. SCAMMELL:—Mr. Speaker, before the debate on the Address in Reply closes, I should like to avail myself of the opportunity to make one or two references to some of the matters contained in the Speech from the Throne. But, first of all, Sir, I want to extend to you my very sincere congratulations on the honor that has been done you by this House in electing you to the dignified position of First Commoner in the land; a position which you have already shown yourself well worthy of holding. This honor is not alone an honor conferred upon you personally, but upon the fishing community of this country and on your native district of Carbonear. It must indeed be extremely gratifying to a man who has lived a life of strenuous toil such as yours to have reached such a position of honor. I feel sure that under your lead the dignity of this Chamber will be sustained.

I also desire to compliment the proposer and seconder of the Address in Reply, Lieut. Small and Sergt. Major LeGrow, upon the very excellent speeches made by them on that occasion.

The debate which has taken place over this Address has been of extreme interest to us all, and to us junior members of this House not only interesting but instructive as well. It will, I think, be appreciated, Mr. Speaker, that we who are in this Assembly for the first time naturally approach the occasion of our maiden speech with a great deal of timidity and with some diffidence, and if we are wise, we look to the conduct of senior members as our guide in matters of parliamentary procedure and parliamentary etiquette. Our knowledge of public affairs must of necessity be more or less academic, and when a man's knowledge has been derived chiefly from the text book and the lecture room, he cannot be expected to speak with that confidence which naturally characterizes the utterances of members more practically experienced in public matters.

While we look to the speeches of the older members chiefly with interest as to what they may contain by way of just criticism, useful information and valuable suggestions, we look forward to the speeches of junior members with the added interest of curiosity as to the manner of their delivery and the language of their composition. It was with this added interest that I listened to the speeches of junior members on the Opposition side of this House. On this account I desire now, Sir, to extend my congratulations to Mr. Fox, the Honorable Member for St. John's East. I regard the speech made by him on the opening day as one of the finest efforts in debate made in this House during this session. Its predominant note appeared to be the sincerity with which it was delivered, and if the Honorable member proposes to give to everything he will do in the future the same sincerity as he displayed on that occasion, then I predict, Sir, that he will go a long way in the public life of this Dominion. His address was at once interesting and instructive.

It is very naturally the duty of the Opposition to criticise, but, at the same time, that criticism should be tempered with a due amount of consideration for the dignity of this House. Some of the Honorable Members opposite have expressed a great deal of disappointment and surprise at the Speech from the Throne, many

of them pointing out that the Speech is remarkable, not so much for what it does contain as for what it does not contain. Now, Sir, I cannot see that the Speech must of necessity foreshadow all the legislation that need be enacted at this session, and before this House closes I think that we shall have done a great deal more in the matter of legislation than was anticipated by the Speech.

Some members have held up the manifesto of the Leader of the Government as placed before the electorate last Autumn, pointing out the utter absence from the Speech of many important promises of legislation outlined in that manifesto. I do not think, Sir, that it is necessary for the Government to embody in its first Speech from the Throne all the legislation promised for a period of four years. In my opinion if the Government of the day is able to carry through even the legislation foreshadowed in this Speech, they will have gone a long way in the fulfilment of their pre-election promises, and gone a long way in justifying the confidence reposed in them by the electorate at the last general election.

In listening to the criticisms of Honorable members, I was reminded of that admirable parody of Bright's on some lines in "Grey's Elegy," which goes like this:

"For who to dumb forgetfulness aprey
The pleasing sweets of office e'er resigned,
Left the warm precincts of the Treasury,
Nor cast one longing, lingering glance behind."

and I wondered how much of their criticism was actuated by feelings like that.

Mr. MacDonnell, the Honourable Member for St. George's, expressed some anxiety as to the possibility of unrest and disturbances among the people. I do not deny that as a result of conditions directly attributable to the war, a position has arisen which makes for an unsettled public mind. But, surely Mr. Speaker, the greatest safeguard we, in this country, can have against anything of the nature contemplated by the Honorable gentleman is a Government so immensely popular and fortified with such overwhelming support as the Government in power to-day, and I can assure the Honourable Gentleman and this House, that stirring events will have indeed to transpire before the confidence of the electorate in this Government is shaken. We have gained their confidence and we are not likely to do anything or to refrain from doing anything which may on the one hand alarm the electorate, or on the other cause us to lose their confidence.

To my mind, sir, the subject which takes precedence of all others in this Speech is the subject of Coast and Inland Transportation. The Government, in this problem, has got a big question to face. The whole service seems to be disorganized, and the facilities at our disposal are absolutely inadequate to cope with the increased demand for freight and passenger accommodation. All will admit the difficulty of arriving at a successful solution of the problem due very largely to the shortage of available tonnage. I can tell this House that much trade is being lost to this country and this town in particular as a result of the condition of our Coastal Service. Particularly is this true of the West Coast. I regret that the Honorable member for St. George's is not on this side of the House, so that he and I could get together and think out a good Coastal proposition for the betterment of con-

ditions on the West Coast. Let me give this House an instance. I have in mind a case that came under my notice at Bonne Bay during my campaign last Autumn. Two commercial travellers, one representing a St. John's firm, the other a Halifax firm, were endeavouring to sell flour to the Bonne Bay merchants. The St. John's firm was able to compete with the Halifax firm as far as the question of price was involved, but when the question of delivery came up the St. John's man was left behind. The St. John's firm might be able to deliver the goods in a fortnight or three weeks. The Halifax firm gave an absolute guarantee to deliver the goods in ten days, and consequently got the order. The firm of Farquhar & Company are giving the West Coast a line of steamers from Halifax via North Sydney, and Halifax firms are therefore attracting West Coast business. I do not say that West Coast firms are anxious to patronize Halifax business, but unless we can give them an adequate Coastal Service ensuring fairly prompt deliveries, the whole trade must go to Canadian ports. I realize that this subject of transportation is a big one, but we should tackle it at once, even if we have to go to the extent of building the ships ourselves. Naturally, this year, we shall have to put up with some make-shifts, but I am prepared that my constituents will be perfectly reasonable when once the situation has been placed before them, and a reasonable hope held out that the ships will be forthcoming another season.

Just a word, sir, in reference to the Fishery Regulations. I am not a business man and therefore dare not presume to discuss these regulations in relation to their effect on prices, but I think that the statements made by the Honorable Minister of Marine & Fisheries have conclusively proved, even to the most sceptical, that the regulations have stimulated prices, and obviated what would have been a severe disaster last season. There is, however, a phase of these fishery regulations that I consider I am perfectly qualified to speak on, that is the phase of the regulations or of the Bill that was brought in respecting the regulations, that relates to the cure and cull of fish. I come from a fishing family, and have served a four years' apprenticeship on a Labrador fishing schooner. As the travelling delegate of the Fishermen's Protective Union I have visited nearly every place of any importance in the Island, and I have always taken the trouble to view conditions as they prevail and to get the opinions of fishermen everywhere with regard to fishery matters. There is a decided opinion in the country in support of a move to improve the cure of our fish. There may be many causes why we are not producing a better article. To my mind fish should be thoroughly washed from the knife before being salted away, and when fish is being washed preparatory to being dried in the sun every fish separately should be washed and not a large quantity thrown into a tub and just mopped over with a swab. Fishermen have frequently expressed the opinion to me that dirty salt is largely responsible for bad fish. Sometimes in the Autumn salt is removed from vessels and resold the next Spring and perhaps used during the ensuing season. Such salt is detrimental to the curing of a good fish. As pointed out by the Honorable Minister of Marine the buyers themselves are largely to blame for the wretched condition of our fish. I have known cases where two schooners in the same port have arrived from the Labrador at the same time. One man takes all

the trouble in the world to make good fish. The other man gives his fish a rough overhauling and disposes of it as quickly as possible, not infrequently receiving a much higher figure than the man who has taken the trouble to make a good article. This is only encouraging men to make bad fish, and the sooner the proposed bill is put on the Statute Book and a proper system of grading, standardization and cull inaugurated, the sooner shall we be producing a better article and obtaining better prices abroad. No one who knows Mr. Coaker will, for one moment, doubt his sincerity, and fishermen everywhere are prepared to stand by him and support him in this great work he has undertaken.

The Marine and Fisheries Departmen is at last receiving that attention which its importance merits. It is ceasing to be merely a department concerned with lighthouses and marine works, and is about to perform the important function which such a department in a country like ours should perform. The proposed research bureau in connection with that department is a long felt want, as there is undoubtedly abundant valuable information regarding the habits of our fish denied to us every year because of our having no such bureau. The question of profiteering has been brought forward and discussed by members on the opposite side of the House, and I heard a great deal of the subject during my campaign and during my recent visits to the Districts of Fogo and Bonavista. Especially was this so in regard to the question of salt, and I was pleased to note the statement made by Mr. Coaker while on this subject the other night. He has said that altho last year salt freight was 22 shillings and this year freight has risen to 45 shillings with salt costing one dollar extra, yet salt this year will be sold for $3.70 per hogshead instead of $5.70, as would have been the case if the same gentlemen who are now in the Opposition were controlling the Government as they were last Spring, when such outrageous profiteering on salt was permitted. This statement will give fishermen everywhere an added interest and confidence in the Government and demonstates conclusively that questions affecting the welfare of the fishermen will at all times receive the very earnest consideration of this Government, and I say that if this Government can give the fishermen salt this year at even one fifty cent piece less than they paid last year, they will undoubtedly enlist the wholehearted support of the body of fishermen all over the country. There is undoubtedly a very decided opinion in the country that the Government should do something with regard to this question of profiteering, and I, myself, should like to see the Government interest itself in this subject.

I understand, Sir, that there is an Act in force in England today under which a man or women who purchases an article and who think they have paid more than a reasonable price for it can avail of an opportunity to bring their case before a local committee of investigation appointed under the Act, and have their case enquired into. By way of example, I was reading of a case the other day where a lady bought a pair of shoes. She considered that she had been charged an unreasonable figure for the shoes. She took her case before the local committee and on investigation is was proved that the shopkeeper had charged a profit of sixty-five per cent, and as the maximum profit allowed on that class of shoe under the Act was thirty three and one-third per cent, the retailer had to give the lady a rebate equal to the

excess profit in addition to having pay the fine imposed under the Act. If the Government could bring a scheme something like this, I feel sure that public opinion on the question would be met, and altho' I am not in a position to make an announcement, I believe it is to the intention of the Government to bring in some sort of legislation dealing with this question.

The subject of Sectarianism has received considerable attention from both sides of the House during the debate, and I want to say a few words on the subject myself. My opponent stated at a public meeting here during the bye-election that sectarianism had been responsible for his defeat and my success. I do him the honor of saying that he did not charge me with having used sectarianism, but, Sir, the natural inference from such a statement was that I had used it. The charge I have already refuted in the newspapers, and I want to refute it in this House. The people of the District of St. Barbe are as broad-minded and tolerant as any people in this Dominion. I have in mind now the case of the Church of England clergyman at Cow Head. He has during his parochial visits to call at a place called Port aux Choix, and while there he always boards with a Roman Catholic and conducts his services at the residence of a man who belongs to the Methodist Church.

Now, Sir, I want to ask you and to ask the House if anywhere in this Dominion there is to be found a better example of broad-mindedness and utter absence of anything like narrow sectarian feeling. And this, Sir, is an index of feeling that prevails all over the District. Sectarianism did not defeat Captain Kean. I won my election because I was with the Liberal Party, and if I go back to St. Barbe four years from now with the same party, I shall win again.

I want while I am on this point to refer to a remark, or rather to the general tenor of the remarks made by the Honorable Member for St. John's West, Mr. Bennett, while on this subject. He poses here as the champion of the Church of England. Now. Sir, if the honorable gentleman has been filling that role in the past, I do not see anything in the records to prove that he has been a very ardent champion. I, myself, come from a good old Church of England family, and I yield second place to no man in my allegience to that Church, and I want to assure the honorable member for St. John's West that he need have no anxiety as to the interests of our Church being lost sight of. We, on this side of the House, who are members of the Church of England will see to it that we get our fair share of what is due us, being prepared at all times to be fair and square, and to give and take.

I should like, Mr. Speaker, to say a word in reference to the subject of Education, and the new Department about to be created. However, as the time for adjournment is now at hand, and as I have no desire to prolong the debate, I shall reserve my remarks till the House goes into Committee on the Bill that will be submitted. It is a subject that I am deeply interested in, having been, myself, a teacher for four years. I should like to say that I am as much in the dark as members on the other side as to what the Bill will contain; but I do know this, and I make the statement in order to allay any doubt that may exist on the subject, that we do not propose to upset the existing denominational system now in vogue, but rather to enthuse it with new vigor and efficiency. I am not so sure that I, myself, would be prepared to support a Bill that proposed to upset the existing denominational system.

I am proud, Sir, to be associated

with a Government that proposes to establish a Department of Education. I want right here to pay a word of tribute to the Honorable Dr. Barnes, who will be our first Minister of Education. He is an old teacher of mine, and the first professional training I received as a teacher I received from Dr. Barnes. He is eminently qualified for the high position he is called upon to fill, from long, practical experience as a teacher, and from his intellectual attainments, attainments that have been enhanced by travel and study in all the leading educational centres of Europe and America.

I will not delay the House longer, but when we go into Committee on the proposed Bill, I shall have something more to say on this subject.

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled Report of the Board of Pension Commissioners.

On motion the debate on the address in reply was adjourned until next session.

Pursuant to order and on motion on Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Department of Posts and Telegraphs" was read a seconed time and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 176 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series entitled "Of the Encouragement of Shipbuilding" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this bill I would point out to the House that it does not contain any radical alterations to the Shipbuilding Act of 1916. At the present time schooners up to the size of 120 and 130 tons receive a bonus. We have made up our minds that the class of foreign vessel needed in the future will not exceed 160 or 170 tons, and this class of vessel will suit the Newfoundland foreign market fish trade. I think the day has gone for larger size vessels. In future fish will be shipped in steamers. The Marine and Fisheries Department will take up this matter during the summer and will endeavour to have steamers leaving here every three weeks for Spain, Greece and Italy in the fall and winter.

Under this bill vessels with tonnage up to 150 or 160 tons will receive the bounty. There has been a considerable amount of strong feeling in connection with this bounty matter, as one ship at 130 tons received bounty, while one at 140 was excluded.

Another section provides that there shall be a rebate of duty paid upon any of the materials used in the construction of vessels that did not receive the bounty. Some vessels built during the past two years were excluded from receiving the bounty, as they were too large, but the builders expected and believed they would receive the rebate of duty, but we now find the Bounty Act deprives all vessels from receiving rebate of duty that are not entitled to the bounty.

Another point in relation to the rebate of duty is that after a vessel is built in the country it must be found that she was built in accordance with Schedule A or B of the Shipbuilding Act of Newfoundland. At the present time if a man does not build a vessel for a bounty he can put any kind of plank or other material in her which he wishes, and send her to sea, and there is nothing in the Newfoundland Law to prevent him

from so doing regardless of how that vessel was constructed.

We want all our vessels built here according to Schedule A or B of the Shipbuilding Act, and when this Bill becomes law no one will be able to build a vessel in Newfoundland unless under inspection whether he receives a bounty or not. This is a very important point and one to which, I think, every honourable member in this House will agree to. We have no right to allow any man to use three inch plank when the plank should be four inches, and timbers eight inches apart when they should be four inches or six inches thick when they should be eight.

If keels for smaller vessels and smaller craft like the western boats are laid down, they will not be interfered with as they are built in accordance with Schedule C and will qualify for the bounty. We are going to take the power to have all vessels built well and under inspection, and I think every honourable member will agree with me that the time is fully ripe for taking that step.

Therefore, I have much pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in moving the Second Reading of this Bill.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, April 30th, 1920.

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

It was ordered that the Minutes of Thursday's Session stand over for confirmation until next session.

MR. HIGGINS: — Mr. Speaker, through the courtesy of the Prime Minister, I am able to present a petition from the people of Pouch Cove, asking the Government to provide a public wharf at that place. The petition is signed by the Rev. Mr. Tulk, Rev. Mr. Holmes, and Rev. Fr. Pippy, and so far as I can peruse by practically every fishermen in Pouch Cove. To those who are acquainted with the place they will appreciate that there is nothing, perhaps, that is wanted more in Pouch Cove than a public wharf. As far as I can remember the people of Pouch Cove have depended largely upon the use more or less, or private waterfronts. It's an important section of St. John's East, perhaps the biggest fish killing settlement on the shore, and I think it will be found that there are no people all along the shore in St. John's East that applies themselves harder to the fishery than do the people at Pouch Cove. They carry out their work under considerable disadvantages, as the place is usually storm swept, and I think it is really a reflection on the industry and determination of that class of men not to have a public wharf erected there. The amount of fish caught there annually by these industrious people is very large, and to their credit I may say that they are always alive to matters of public improvement. Within recent years certain things have been done down there that tended to improve conditions, notably the matter of a motor hoist was arranged and installed there. I hope that when the Marine and Fisheries Department takes the earliest opportunity to spend money that will not forget Pouch Cove, as I do not thing that there is anything that means more to the people of that place than the erection of a public wharf.

In light of the suggestion made they recommend that a suitable and practical man be sent there and re-

port to the Government so that the best effort will be made to fulfil their request. Because it will mean so much to the men of the place, because it has been looked for so long, because it is endorsed by the entire locality and because of the importance of the settlement I support this petition with all earnestness and trust the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will give it the best possible consideration and while I recognize that because of past storms considerable demands have been made in the past on the Department, I feel that if it is at all possible something will be done. I therefore support the prayer of the petition.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petition presented by my honourable colleague, and endorse all that has been said, and hope and trust that the petition will be given the sympathy and attention that it deserves, as the grant of it's request will greatly forward the work of the people of Pouch Cove and the interests of the settlement.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—Mr. Speaker. I beg to support the petition as presented by my honourable colleague, and hope and trust that it will receive the consideration it deserves. There should have been a wharf built at Pouch Cove years ago. Shoe Cove and other places there badly need the convenience of a public wharf.

MR. TARGETT:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Apsey Brook. They ask for a grant of two hundred dollars to build roads and bridges. The people have inhabited this place for the last fifty years and during that period have not had any public road. They need these very badly, and I trust when this petition goes to the department to which it relates it will receive the best consideration possible. Mr. Speaker, I also present another petition from the people of New Harbor, and another from the people of Harcourt, Smith's Sound. They all require the same things, roads and bridges. They are badly needed by the various localities. On account of the crisis through which we have passed during the past few years we know, it is difficult to find much money for roads and bridges, but I hope in the future enough will be obtainable to fulfil the requests for the building of roads and bridges. I also present another from the people of Chance Cove asking for a road. I ask that these petitions be referred to the Department to which tney belong.

Mr. GUPPY:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the prayer of the petition presented by my honourable colleague.

MR. SCAMMEL:—I wish, Mr. Speaker, to present a petition from the inhabitants of Belburns in the District of St. Barbe. It asks for telephone communication. This settlement is only a small place, but I ask that it be not judged by its size. The fishermen of this place are very industrious and the nearest place is Daniel's Cove. They also ask that a boat call there. They must of necessity take their produce to that place and owing to the uncertainty of passing ships they suffer a lot of hardship, and sometimes have to remain there for days. If they only had telephone communication they would be saved a lot of trouble and expense. The request is very needful and reasonable. It is a request which if granted would mean a lot to the men of the District of St. Barbe. I therefore ask that the matter be referred to the department to which it appertains.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from some two hundred men, fishermen of St. John's West,

asking that a canal or gut be placed at Freshwater Bay. I understand the project was commenced by the late government and there is now a lot of material left on the bank so it would be convenient to again start the work. It would be a great advantage as it would be the means of saving lives and property and the storms in the past have wraught tremendous havoc out there. The north east winds are felt very badly. Whilst this petition is signed largely by people from St. John's West I think that the honourable member for St John's East will agree that the advantage will be also felt in his district. The grant of this petition will relieve tne congestion felt at the North Battery in the east end of the district and also believe the congestion in the West end of the district. Iam sure the other members of the district will support this, and I hope the govt will look into the matter. I ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. BENNETT:—Mr. Speaker, I wish to support the prayer of the petition. I am glad that the hon. member for St. John's West brought this matter before the House and I am happy to support and advocate its operation. It was last year when this matter was dealt with and was found possible to start the work. As it was pointed out by the hon. member there is a large amount or material at present around the local ity and it is easy to start the work commenced last season. This gut in my estimation will be of untold benefit to the fishermen population of St. John's and will fill a want long felt both in St. John's and Blackhead. The situation in Black head as I understand it, is that the people there have almost invariably installed motors in their boats and it is impossible to leave them on the collars because of the storms that prevail there and the result is that they would be washed ashore and consequently destroyed. When as it often happens they come from Blackhead into St. John's they cannot go back. The petition ought to receive the most careful consideration of the entire government. In my opinion the settlement out there can be converted into a most desirable fishing village. Around the pond situated at Blackhead the land is owned by private individ uals and while I was in power I servenotice on the owners that some day they may have to sell their rights for a reasonable figure. On that account it will require a large sum of money to acquire the land. It would be necessary to acquire all the land around this pond to make a suitable place for the fishermen.

In Sir Edward Morris' time the idea of opening up of this gut was afoot but as the money was not available it was not acted upon. But I hope the Government will continue the work. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance are influential persons and they ought to be able to have the great undertaking continued. I have great pleasure therefore in supporting the prayer of this petition.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the prayer of the petition presented by the honorable Minister of Finance. No doubt St. John's West will benefit greatly by the opening up of this gut and I am certain that the fishermen of St. John's East would in no less degree profit in having this gut constructed. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I heartily support the petition.

Mr. Speaker intimated that he had received the following correspondence from His Excellency the Governor, which he read to the House:

The Governor has the honor to communicate to the Honourable House of

Assembly the apopintment of the Commissioners of Internal Economy of the Legislature in accordance with the provisions of the Statute 61 Victoria Cap. 1, as set forth in the accompanying certified copy of a minute of the Honourable Executive Council approved by the Governor on the 16th March.

(Sgd.) C. ALEXANDER HARRIS,
Governor.

Government House,
St. John's, Nfld.,
29th April, 1920.

Certified copy of minutes of the Honourable Executive Council approved by His Excellency the Governor on the 16th March, 1920.
March 15th, 1920.

Under provision of Section 4, Cap. 1, 61 Victoria, "Internal Economy Act," the following to be the Internal Economy Commission, namely:

The President of the Legislative Council, Hon. R. K. Bishop, Hon. George Shea.

Speaker House of Assembly, Hon. R. A. Squires, K.C.; Hon. W. R. Warren, K.C.; Hon. W. F. Coaker.

Certified true copy.

(Sgd.) ARTHUR MEWS,
Deputy Colonial Secretary.

MR. Mac DONNELL:—Mr. Speaker, I wish, Sir, to move the adjournment of this House to give time to consider the uncalled for and unjust attack made upon me yesterday by the hon. member for Harbor Grace. His attack on me comes under two heads: First, the statement in The Evening Herald. Now Mr. Speaker, I am going to read the whole article in order to show up Mr. Archibald, and to show this House just what it does contain. (Reads article.)

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to explain to this House the reason for that article. There appeared in the columns of The Daily Star newspaper an article to the effect that the candidates for Sir Michael Cashin in Placentia and St. Mary's had made sectarian appeals while canvassing their districts last election. Mr. Walsh refuted this charge in an article to the newspapers over his own signature. Now, Mr. Speaker, was that not fair that The Evening Herald should comment on Mr. Walsh's article It did so under the heading, "A Complete Refutation." The letter was a complete denial that any such conduct had been resorted to by the candidates for Placentia district. We put the two cases together. We believe that Mr. Walsh made no such appeal, and we believe that Mr. Archibald did not do as reported. Now, Mr. Speaker, there can be put one or two explanations of the hon. member's action yesterday in this House. That statement was either made through malice or ignorance. If through malice, there are no words too strong to condemn the hon. member. If through ignorance there are no words of mine sufficiently expressive of the pity I feel for the low standard of intelligence of the man who made the charge. If Mr. Archibald had searched the back files of the newspapers as I had to do this morning I think that he would remember the date when the article appeared. It goes to show that ignorance was the foundation of his statement. I was not given a chance to reply yesterday, and he did not answer me in the hope that I would not get a chance to reply. There is only one course open, namely, that Mr. Archibald withdraw that statement. The second charge is more serious, particularly because of the manner in which it was treated. The hon. gentleman used these words: "If this continues there will be trouble." You allowed him to refer that statement to me, and you allowed him to make his own deductions. He drew the inference that I

was. dealing with sectarianism when I made my speech and used these words. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have the official copy of my speech right here, and there is not in it one mention made of sectarianism. But when I do refer to it there will be no doubt as to what I mean. I use no back doors. There is absolutely no justification for allowing a member to do as the hon. member did yesterday. I will not submit to that conduct in the future. If I am not allowed to answer such charges by means of the usual courtesies 'of this House, I will try some other method. Yesterday I could not give the chapter and the page of the manual on procedure dealing with such matters at the time, but I came to it later. But I was sure I was in order in demanding the right to answer this charge.

There is a specific issue before the House and I demand here and now, Mr. Speaker, that you decide whether the charges made against me by the member for Harbor Grace are true or not, and if not true that he ask the person who made them to make an unqualified withdrawal.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker may I ask the member for St. George's what it is he wants you to decide.

HON MacDONNELL—I want the speaker to decide whether or not there is anything in my speech to warrant the charge of the member for Harbor Grace that I used sectarianism and, secondly, whether there is anything in the short article in The Herald referred to that makes any charge against the member for Harbor Grace, and further, that if there is nothing to substantiate the statements made by that member that he be asked to withdraw them, and I would state, sir that any man who has been accorded the unfair treatment that has been accorded me in the one-sided ruling of the chair, cannot be expected to have that respect for the dignity of this House that he should have

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the question submitted by the member for St. George's is one for your consideration. Iregret that I was not in the House at the time this discussion took place and am therefore not in a position to give an opinion, but I submit sir, that it is no part of your duty to read newspapers and dictate on any matter contained in them. If the member for St. George's charges the member for Horbor Grace with breaking any of the rules of the House he should state what rule has been broken before demanding a decision from the Speaker on the point.

MR. MacDONNELL—Mr. Speaker I submit that it is not necessary for me to furnish proof that what I say is true when I deny the statements of the member for Harbor Grace, but in order to save time I have submitted absolute proof of the fact and if it is not your duty to read anything appearing in a newspepers there is no reason whatever that I can see why you should refuse to read my speech and decide whether or not there os anything in it that could beconstrued into even a resemblance to sectarianism.

HON MINISTER OF JUSTICE—What I understand the member for St. George's to say is that he is not responsible for the newspaper article referred to and that the other charge is that he used language in his speech savoring of sactarianism.

MR. MacDONNELL—No sir, I accept full responsibility for that article but what I do say is that there is no charges contained therein against Mr. Archibald.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Oh, I see, I thought that you dis-

claimed responsibility for the article in question, but I think that the matter of the construction placed upon a statement by either one honorable member of another is no matter for the Speaker. As to the other charge, that is also a matter of opinion. Personally I do not remember anything in the speech of the member for Harbor Grace that had any reference to sectarianism. I understand the matter under consideration by the hon. member when he used the words to which the member for St. George's took exception, was the high cost of living, and what he said was that if profiteering did not stop trouble would arise. I do not think that the member for Harbor Grace would maliciously misconstrue anything said by the hon. member.

MR. MacDONNELL:—It is the matter of Mr. Archibald's explanation that makes Mr. Archibald's meaning unmistakeable. In making his explanation the member for Harbor Grace said he was not speaking to the Catholic people of the country, nor to the Catholic members of the Opposition as a whole, but to me personally, and his remarks were made either maliciously or without knowing what he was talking about.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I am sure he did not make the statement maliciously and will be only glad to give a satisfactory explanation, but as to the newspaper article in question I do not think that you, Mr. Speaker, can be expected to deliver judgment on that. As to the reference to the speech I bear out the member for St. George's, and I am sure that anything said by the member for Harbor Grace he will be only too glad to withdraw. It is regrettable that these things should occur, but they are unfortunately sometimes unavoidable.

MR. MacDONNELL:—Mr. Speaker, while I appreciate the remarks of the hon. Minister of Justice and thank him for them, I still wish to place on record my contention that it should not be made a precedent that, that which is a lie should be allowed to go by as a harmless mistake.

MR. ARCHIBALD:—Mr. Speaker, judging from the way the hon. member Mr. MacDonnell, just delivered his spite speech, it is quite apparent that I must have stepped on his corns. His effort in insinuating in editorial of The Herald of Jan. 3rd that I held an orange in one hand and a set of Roman Catholic prayer beads in the other while campaigning Harbor Grace district, has recoiled on his own head, and I want to tell him, Sir, that before I allow him to paint me in that garb he will hear more than he bargained for. He will have a job to explain to the people of this country why he allowed some of that vile stuff to appear in the editorial columns of The Herald just before the bye-election of which he just admitted full responsibility. For, Mr. Speaker, if I have to read some of this high class literature of his to this House he will find it difficult to explain to the Protestant people satisfactorily why he did it.

I am glad to notice, Mr. Speaker, from the editorial comment of The Evening Herald of April 30th, that in his attempt to vilify me (which is like water on a duck's back) he was so excited that he lauded Hon. Mr. Coaker to the sky when he says, it requires energy, brains and executive ability to reach the position which Mr. Coaker fills so "admirably" in this dominion. I say so too, and am very glad to note The Herald can tell the truth once in a long while.

I also note that The Herald is trying to take back water when they say that they might have been misinformed about me using the orange and prayer beads on the campaign. They also say that when they are assured that they

are wrong they will not hesitate to say so. Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope that he will have the good manners to apologise when he finds out the whole truth of the matter. For if he does not I will tell him that Harbor Grace district will resent the insult hurled at them. I assure Mr. MacDonnell that the Harbor Grace district people are not the kind that would allow any man to appear before them on a public platform using such despicable tactics, and he will find out that at the next election Harbor Grace district will teach him that they are not going to be insulted. Mr. MacDonnell need not waste any printers' ink in telling Harbor Grace district about Archibald, because they know him quite well, as he will see from the big majorities we rolled up at the polls; but he does not want facts, he wants camouflage. But Sir, he cannot put camouflage over me. If he tries it he will get back some unvarnished facts which he evidently does not like.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Mr. Speaker, I wish to call your attention to the fact, that up to the present time, the correspondence I have asked for from the Colonial Secretary, has not been laid upon the table of the House. The question I referred to Sir, was asked April 27th, referring to Mr. Harry J. Crowe.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I have been in touch with the Minister of Agriculture and Mines in connection with that matter, and up to this morning he was not able to find any correspondence, but they are pursuing the search and when it if found you will have it.

MR. SULLIVAN—I want to call the attention of the Hon. Prime Minister to the fact that it was not altogether a matter of correspondence between Mr. Harry Crow, and the Reid Nfld. Co. and I think if he will send an enquiry to some of the other public departments he might find what has been asked. I know there is correspondence, Mr. Speaker, and I am quite sure he will be able to locate it. Another matter, Mr. Speaker, and one which has a great interest for the people of the country, and one that has a great interest for returned soldiers. and one which the G. W. V. A. is watching closely is the question I asked on April 28th. Surely it is an easy matter for the Prime Minister to say yes or no, to say whether he is going to do this or not.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I don't know whether the Hon. member for Placentia is out of order or not, but the correspondence from the G. W. V. A. has been considerable. Some fifteen or twenty letters have been copied. The balance are being copied and he will have them eomorrow.

MR. WALSH:—Mr Speaker tne district of Placentia and my actions there have been discussed in this House, and with your premission I would like to make a statement with regards to a charge that has been made against me in the press. I want to thank the Hon. member for Hr. Grace for giving me the opportunity of settling once and for all the matter referred to in connection with myself with regard to the election in 1913. Though the matter never came before the House before the charge has been brought up in a paper some seven years ago. The charge was that I publicly exhibited an article of devotion in 1913 in order to gain the votes of the district. One of the chief reasons why I did not take the opportunity of referring to this matter, was that I have too much reverence, too much respect, too much regard for thearticle referred to, and too much confidence in the members who occupy seats in this House to think that I should have to make any

explanation of this charge. If the charge made was that I used that article while canvassing the district, I plead absolutely guilty, and I want to say that since I was a little boy they have been revered and respected by me, and that I would be prepared to safeguard them with my life if necessary. I have carried them with me for twenty-five years. To the charge of using them from a public platform I pleed not guilty and every luckily sitting on the right of me in this house is one of the men who opposed me in 1913, and if there was any truth in that charge surely the man whom it affected most would have some proof. The matter has never been referred to for seven years Never have my colleagues referred to this matter because if Mr Sullivan saw this article and I think he saw this article, know that there were no truth in it. Now I hope that this will end the matter and I trust that never again will I have to refer to any article of devotion used by any denomination and I have the same respect for any article. Now there was a statement made in The Daily Star, that in the district of Placentia and St Mary's if sectarian dodger was used. Immediately I read this article I replied and absolutely denied the charge, as has been said. Since than I have discovered that there was a paper in one section of the district, but I want to say here this afternoon that this dodger or poster was not seen by myself or my colleagues, was not known of by either of us until polling day. The morning of polling day I was at Trepassey, and I saw this thing posted on a fence and I had to enquire where it come from, and who was responsible for it, and I want to say if any gentleman in this House, or outside this House, can say that I have used sectarianism in my district, or that I know anything about the dodger until the morning of polling day, I am satisfied to place my resignation in the hands of the Prime Minister. I hope that what I have said is enough, and that I will not have to refer to this matter again.

MR. JONES:—Mr. Speaker, I rise for the first time to address this honourable House of Assembly, and, I might say, that perhaps it is more difficult for me than it is for any other member to make a speech. I want you to clearly understand what I am. Some of the members are much younger than I am. Politically they are exactly the same age as I am, though, in point of years, I have the advantage. Some having been schoolmasters and received an education, while the education I received was all finished before I arrived at the age of ten years. From that age I started to get my education in the fishing business, and I have spent over forty years going to school and my education is not finished yet. In the light of all that I have heard during my short time in this House, I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that I hope you will not be too severe in your condemnation if I make any mistakes, and I know that I shall make them. If I make a laughing stock of myself, then I expect you to laugh, or if I deserve your censure then I expect to be censured. I shall have to bear it as well as I can, but do not pity me. I extend to you, Mr. Speaker, my heartiest congratulations, and in view of what I am and who I am, I think I can share in the honor conferred upon you, because with the exception of Mr. Guppy, the hon. member for Trinity, I am the only fisherman, belonging to the rank and file of the fishermen, holding a seat here at the present time. I was on the Labrador last year and had the good fortune to secure a bumper trip of eleven hun-

dred quintals of fish, and I confidently expect to do the same next summer. Therefore, in being a fisherman, I am sharing in the honor with you. I will not proceed until I congratulate the two gallant young men, the proposer and seconder of the Address in Reply. These two noble young men did their duty in the great war, which has happily ended. They have nobly done their part. They have helped to make the land and Empire that we are proud of, free. They have done their part nobly and they have helped to render stainless the flag that we all love so well. In the words of one long before us, "Cheers for the living and tears for the dead."

I have nothing to commend myself to you, Sir. I have no especial qualifications for a seat in this House except the hope that I have an ordinary share of common sense and some know ledge of the local needs and requirements of the people of Newfoundland and particularly the people of Twillingate District that I represent, and I desire to do something for those people, mainly for the fisher folk.

Now, I am not going to detain the House very long, but I think I might say something about fish. I know something about the catching and curing of fish, but regarding the marketing and the fishery regulations I am not prepared to attempt to speak. Having spent forty years at the work I believe that I know something about the catching and curing of fish, how to make it good and how it make it bad. I am glad that I belong to a class of people that are noted for the good quality of fish that they make. Of course I will have to be careful of what I am saying, because the man whom I sold my fish to all my life is sitting here listening to what I am saying, although I fear not contradiction, because I never made any bad fish. I suppose every fisherman would say the same. I think it is time for us fishermen to see to it that we are more careful in making our fish, because our future prosperity depends upon it.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition, Sir Michael Cashin, said the other day that it costs more to make bad fish than it did to make good fish, which is very true. When you let fresh water get on it and have to salt it over two or three times, especially so when after all the trouble he should get two or three dollars per quintal less for it. I have a good many times brought home cargoes of eight or ten hundred quintals and taken a good deal of it on my own place to make, but never allow any fresh water on it, we always have coverings for fish on the flakes. No one can make good fish after it has had fresh water on it, and if a fisherman has not got coverings he should put his fish in his store or stage. Now the thing that the fisher men need is not so much to be told how to make fish as to give him an incentive for making it good; if you do that you will have found the remedy.

Every fisherman knows that fish should be split before it gets soft. Everyone may not know that it should be split to the tip of the tail but they will soon take a hint when it is given and when it is made worth while.

Every fisherman knows that no liver or guts or blood should be left on the fish, every fisherman knows that fish should be washed clean and everything possible done to keep it clean and decent so that it may be fit to eat; everyone knows that it should be salted properly for Labrador or shore, which ever way it is being cured, the only way then is to standardize cull of fish and pay for it according to quality. It may be that some will have to learn to their cost, but better to learn that way than to put bad fish on the market.

At present it does not matter much whether you make good fish or bad, you get paid about the same. Much has been said about what may be done to better the conditions of the fishermen. I hope that the time has come when there will be something done along those lines. A friend reminded me of how we used to read the papers when the House was in session and look for something that might be said about the fishing interests of the country, but looked in vain. Now my friend said we cannot say that any more because much is being said on fishery matters, and more than that, we are glad to believe that something is being done.

Some steps have been taken with regard to the culling and standardizing of fish. It is absolutely necessary that we should get a fair price for our fish. Everyone is aware of the uncertainty that attends a fisherman's calling, not to be sure when you start out on a summer's voyage whether you will get any fish or not, is quite enough to worry a man, without having to worry over the price, but we are satisfied to put up with that if we could have a reasonable amount of assurance that we would be paid a fair price for what we got. I cannot believe that there is no way possible to be found to regulate prices, so that there will not be so much uncertainty. If something is not done to assure us of fair paying prices I am afraid that the time is fast coming when fishermen will be scarce. What if we went out on strike? Every other class or union can do so, but they say the fishermen cannot. Well, perhaps he cannot, but a great many of them can certainly leave the country, can go over to Canada or the United States and go fishing, where the government would protect their interests. I have one of the best fishing schooners ever built in Newfoundland, the traps and motor boats, everything necessary to prosecute the fishery, but if some one could assure me now that I would not get ten dollars per quintal for my fish next summer, I would telegraph to my son to-morrow morning and tell him to sell it to whoever would give most of it, and go to Canada of the Unites States, and when a home was provided the rest of the family would follow There would be nothing else for us to do. We are glad to know that something is going to be done by the present government, glad to know that we have at the head of that Important department of Marine and Fisheries, a practical, capable and energetic man, he is the fisherman's friend. I think that it is fitting that the President of the Fishermen's Protective Union should be Minister of Marine and Fisheries. We have very confidence in him, we believe he will look after the fishermen's interest, he not failed us in the past, when he does it will be time enough to go back on him, at the same time we do not bow down and worship him. We know he is a moral man, we know he may make some mistakes, but we believe he is sincere, and what he is trying to do is for the best interest of the country. As to making mistakes the man who has never made any has never done anything worth wile, and may I not say that if he had never made a mistake he would be much too good a man to do it here with the crowd of sectarian bigots and political sinners, that are here, judging from all that have been said and admissions that have been made.

Now Mr. Speaker, on the subject of sectarianism, there is an article which appeared in The Evening Telegram on November 18th, I want to read a portion of that article which was copied from a Toronto paper I take it that the fact that it was

copied indicates that it was endorsed by the editor, and that he takes responsibility for it. I will read that part that refers to sectarianism and the people of the north.

Mr. Speaker, one of the Hon gentlemen on the other side the other day reminded us that we are not quite so fleshy on this side of the House as they were on that side. I suppose tnis means that it is natural to kick when you grow fat. If it is so, if the gentleman on the other side kick a little you will not blame them, it is only natural.

MR. SAMSON:—Mr. Speaker, upon rising to address this House for the first time, allow me to congratulate you on the high honor conferred upon you in your appointment to the Speaker's chair. I wish to extend my congratulations to our war veterans, Messrs. Small and LeGrow, the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply, for their splendid speeches. I also wish to compliment my honorable friend, Mr. Fox, upon his magnificent address, and I trust that his political record will be such that we shall always have occasion to feel proud of him.

With regard to sectarianism, it seems to me that certain politicians in this town during the General and the Bye-Elections were guilty of breaches of religious etiquette, and not being contented with what had been accomplished on the platform and in the press, had to drag religious sentiment by the neck into this Assembly. This town of St. John's was a hot-bed of sectarianism during the elections, and since coming here we have been fed up with it.

I am proud to be able to stand here, Mr. Speaker, and state that the tactics used in the election campaign in St. John's were absent in the North. We put up a clean political fight, and are not ashamed of our record in this respect.

I challenge any man either inside the bar of this House or outside to convict the representatives of Twillingate with using that abominable and disgusting cry of sectarianism. Religion was not mentioned by any one of us. It is disgusting to some of us junior members who represent clean districts to hear honorable members of this House harping so on sectarianism, some of my opponents who have posed as pure innocents in this respect being among the most guilty. Personally it matters not to me whether a man be Catholic or Protestant, as long as he is a man I have every respect for him. I am not a sectarian firebug.

A kind of sentimental appeal issued from the Hon. Mr. Bennett during his speech in relation to the Royal Nfld. Reservist whose fortune it was to be defeated in Trinity Bay. I contend that any sailor or soldier who dons the political uniform to go into the political field must take his chances the same as anybody else, and should sink or swim with his party.

I think the Hon. Leader of the Opposition in his speech the other night commented upon the wretched conditions existing at the Lunatic and Poor Asylums. I do not think these conditions could be attributed to the present Government, which has held office but a few months, but rather the fault lies at the door of past governments.

In connection with the creation of a Department of Education, some honorable friend in the Opposition ranks sarcastically stated that he suppose the new Minister of Education would only have to write out cheques. I contend that the lack of such a department in the past is one of the chief causes of so many illiterate people in this country. The training and grading of teachers, and salaries, the supplying of suitable text books,

the furnishing and supplying of schools, the proper inspection, etc., can only be dealt with by a departmental head.

This subject of education I am very much interested in, as I have spent fifteen years in the teaching profession, and I naturally realize some of the many deficiencies in our present system. When this Bill comes before the House I hope to be able to take an active part in the debate.

We have heard much in reference to the Fish Regulations.

We all remember when the great F. P. U. organization was first started, and many times since, that it met with all kinds of opposition from all directions; but this opposition has been overcome by the organizing ability, industry, honesty, and tenacity of purpose of the Hon. Mr. Coaker.

The Fish Regulations are meeting with somewhat the same opposition, but in the end will, I believe, prove as necessary and useful to the merchants as the F. P. U. is to the fishermen.

The illegal spending of half a million dollars last fall in order to win the election was a grave injustice to this country. The money was not handed over to the legally-appointed Road Boards, but was presented to prospective Cashin candidates, and a great deal of it was wasted. Districts such as Twillingate were robbed of some of their funds and the money handed over to districts supporting the Cashin administration. As a representative of Twillingate District, I shall not be satisfied until such time as the allocations referred to are returned.

Most of us junior members are not here hoping to get-rich-quick or to win political knighthoods, but we are advocates of a clean public service, clean politics freed from sectarianism, clean legislation, and fair treatment to all classes and all creeds.

MR. TARGETT:—Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate you on the high honor that has been conferred upon you. I have not the least doubt that you will do the position credit. I also wan to congratulate the two soldiers who have spoken in reply to the Speech from the Throne. And while I am doing that I am reminded of some remarks that were made by Mr. Bennett regarding Mr. Matthews. I don't believe there is a man in this country who has more respect for a soldier or a sailor than I have. If the gentleman, Mr. Matthews, had come to me and asked me for my place in Trinity District, provided he had come out on our side, I would have given it to him. I believe it is my duty as a representative of Trinity District to state here that Mr. Matthews was treaed with every respect by the people of that district. It was not the man, but the party that they voted against.

I do not say that I gained my election in Trinity because I was Targett but because the party I was associated with was the best party that went to the country. I do not think, with all due respect, that because a man was a soldier or a member of the Royal Naval Reserve a voter should give up the dictates of his conscience to vote for him. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have the greatest respect for both the soldiers and the navy men because I look upon them as men who are willing to give up their lives for their country but, I say, Sir, it was their duty to do so. These young men went to look after the interests of their country, to protect their homes and guard their fathers, mothers, brothers and sisters, and some their wives and children. I say it was their duty and they did it nobly, and Mr. Speaker, there were other men who went from Trinity Dis-

trict besides Mr. Matthews, and some of them made the supreme sacrifice, and even though Mr. Matthews did go out to keep my head on my shoulders is any reason why I should vote contrary to the dictates of my conscience. While I hope we honor these men who went out to fight for us, we should not forget that many of those who stayed at home because they could not go did all they could to help the cause and to carry on the work of those who were gone, and I am happy to say, Mr. S peaker, that we had one man in Hant's Harbor who gave three sons and one daughter to the cause, and that reminds me of the noble part played by the women of this country in the world war. They fought hard even though they were not on the battlefield, they worked early and late, and by their knitting and other efforts helped to make those who were gone comfortable and happy, while we all know the heroic work performed by our Red Cross nurses. I do not think that there is any credit due to the men who passed these remarks about Trinity District.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who represents St. Barbe has spoken about salt, and that reminds me of the different times I have heard of the trouble caused by bad salt in the making of fish. It is impossible to make good fish with bad salt and as the fishery is our staple industry it must be upheld by every means at our disposal. Our aim should be good fish and good prices, and I must say, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side of the House have been endeavoring to do all that is possible towards this end. For many years past fish in this country has not been made as it should have been, and while the fishermen are to some extent responsible for this, those who have been buying it are not entirely blameness. I am glad to say that we are at last becoming educated in this matter as well as in regard to our other fisheries. Some years ago when I was in the lobster business I came here to sell my lobsters I was a total stranger, although I was born in St. John's, and I did not know one buyer from another. I went to a man to see if I could sell my lobsters and the first thing he asked me was what kind they were. I said they were good lobsters, and he replied, "They all say that and sometimes it is scrapings they have instead of lobsters." I said, "I don't know anything about that but my lobsters are there and you can open every tin of them if you want to." The result was that I sold him my lobsters and if I wanted to do so I could have been selling to him up to this day. But, Sir, we Newfoundlanders have not been what we ought to be in the matter of handling our produce, and I am glad we are now becoming educated. I trust the time is coming when every article of fish we pack or cure will be nothing but the best and that Newfoundland will not be behind other countries in the quality of her produce.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that there are brighter days in store for Newfoundland, although on the opening day when I listened to the speeches of the gentleman on the other side, I thought that we were going to have another Black Monday, and I felt sorry for the fishery rules, and sorry to see so many fishermen in the gallery who were facing starvation, but I do not think that things are quite so bad as that nor do I think that they are likely to be. I believe that our fishermen are going to be comfortable and happy, for we have a Government now that will do the very best possible to improve our fish and thereby secure good prices, and that is generally what makes people happy. When a man goes out and toils day after day and winds up his season's work by

getting good prices for his produce he forgets the hard work in the knowledge that he is well paid and that's what is going to happen in the future. I should not be surprised to see many of these young men who have left here to seek their fortunes in other countries coming back here to settle down, because I know, Sir, that they would not enjoy themselves as well anywhere else as they would in Newfoundland if they could make a comfortable living here.

Now Sir, it is not my intention to delay the House any longer than necessary, as we are getting along towards the first of May and I should now be in Hant's Hr. and I trust the time is coming when this House will be open for the transaction of the country's busoness in February or even January.

I don't lay the blame on any particular person, but I do wish that the time will come when we shall have the House open in January or February, becouse to my mind it has been very hot in this House since the session opened, and I think we have been needing a lot of ventilation In 1913 I come into this House and I sat in the cool shade of the opposition side. Perhaps it was better, because at that time I was a greenhorn. Whe I came up the winding stair in 1913 I felt pretty shaky.

I hope Mr. Speaker, the time will soon come when the opposition won't have to climb up a winding ctair, All the same Mr Speaker, I wouldn't like you to be under the impression that it is not a comfortable place down in the opposition room. But I attribute the comfort of the opposition room to our present Minister of Marine and Fisheries Mr. Coaker. I believe it was through him that the oposition room came to be so cosy, and Mr. Jennings will always keep up the good work in this respect and I may say that we are all going to keep up the good work. They say self-praise is no recommendation, but as far as that goes, we are all inclined to praise our actions.

The next subject I see here in the speech from the throne, Mr. Speaker, is the subject of education. My hon. friend up in the corner laughs at me when I say education. He don't know anything about it. He never knew the want of it like I did, Mr. Speaker, I never had a chance to learn. I was left an orphan at eight years of age, and missed my chance in life I had to plod along as best I could. It it a miracle to me that I am in the House of Assembly today.

Now, talking about miracles, I have a little story to tell about a man who went to church to hear a certain clergyman preach on this subject. I don't want to offend any one in telling this story. I want to be fair and equal to every man. We have all read the miracles in the good book, but this particular man did not know what a miracle really ment, and after the clergyman had finished his sermon he approached him and asked him to explain the meaning of miracle. The clergyman in endeavouring to explain the meaning asked him to walk ahead of him, and as he did so he administered a sharp kick to the inquirer and asked him if he felt the smack. The and replied that he did, and the man said if you didn't feel that kick, it would have been a miracle."

But that's not much benefit to the count country Iknow, yet it makes one laugh, and we need a laugh now and than to bringhen things up a bit.

Education means a very serious thing to me. I have a little just enough to get along with, but sir, I am in sympathy with the young generation of today, and from the debths of my heart I pray that the young folks

will have some rules and regulations drawn up for their benefit, and that they will get the opportunities for education that are certainly necessary We want a system in this country whereby every boy and girl will get an education, and I intend to do all I can to help that purpose.

Shipbuilding—well now, I don't know much about that. I had to get a man to build a punt for me once, and I helped him in cutting up some timber for it. He afterwards paid me a great compliment by saying, "I never saw a youngster take things as handy as you do." Now I don't profess to know much about shipbuilding, but I know that we want our ships built to bear the storms they have to face, and I shall do all I can to support a law for improvements in this matter. I don't intend to delay the House much longer, but at any time I think it is my duty to speak, I think I will do it.

Sectarianism. This is a delicate matter to touch on, and it is not for me to say much about. I have much respect for all religions, and I don't care what atlar a man worships at. This is a personal matter between the man and his God. I don't think that in the past years there has been as much talk of sectarianism as there has been this year, but I am glad that the matter has been brought up in this House to be thrashed out once and for all, and that from now on we should never talk about it whether in the House of Assembly or in the campaign.

I tell you, Mr. Speaker, before I leave this House to-night I would like for every man to walk across the floor and shake hands and say that neve. again will sectrianism be used as a weapon in a general election. Life is too short to bother about such stuff, and it is of no benefit to either the members or the people.

MR. ABBOTT:—Mr. Speaker I crave the attention of the House to say one or two words, but before doing so I would like to congratulate you on the high honour conferred upon you as Speaker of this House I am more than pleased, Sir, to see you attain to such an altitude.

I have also much pleasure in congratulating the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne for the able manner in which they addressed the House on that occasion. I refer to Lieutenant Small and Sergeant LeGrow.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that I voice the sentiments of every Honorable Member of this House when I say that each and all of us welcome with joy these gallant heros who did so much for the preservation of Liberty and Freedom.

And I think sir that I voice the sentiments of every Newfoundlander when I say that every one of us is proud that the great world war that raged for four and a half years is over, and the men who went and fought our battles on land and sea, the men who preserved our families, the men who hammered back the Germans, the men who have been our saviours are home.

Of course a large number of these gallant men paid the supreme sacrifice, laid down their lives on the altar of their country, in order that we who didn't go may enjoy liberty and freedom.

To-day, sir, we sympathize with the parents and friends of these heroes, and to those who came home bearing the scars of battle, many of whom incapacitated for life, and to those who were fortunate enough to come back without receiving any wounds, to one and all I think that I am safe in saying that they deserve to be given every consideration, and everything possible done to meet their requirements and

to assist them in life's uneven journey.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are free from Prussianism. The devastation that prevailed in the war zones has ceased, the thousand and one German atrocities are a thing of the past, the victors are home.

The thousands of hearts hitherto crushed by the burden of war are experiencing a new joy, and I hope and trust that that joy will never again be marred by the horrors of war, but that a peace, a lasting peace, a peace that will know war no more forever will be the result.

In reference to the Speech from the Throne I would wish to say that I think every Honourable member opposite seems to be somewhat in accord with every paragraph that it contains, but their chief points of criticism were on matters that it did not contain.

To my mind it would be altogether unnecessary for the Government to put all the good things they intend doing for the country in the Speech from the Throne. What's the use Mr. Speaker of having a Speech long enough to reach from the Bar of the House to the Speaker's chair?

If all the good things forthcoming from His Majesty's Government were outlined in the Speech from the Throne then I think the Honourable members opposite would be criticizing it in a different manner.

In all probability instead of holding itup for ridicule and using some of the slang vernacular they would be terming it an exaggeration, a prevarication, a mis-statement or a hyperbole.

So I think that the Government has adopted a wise plan not to have the good things outlined in the Speech, but to let them come as a surprise.

It is a well known fact that the usual style of Governments in this and other lands has been to open Sessions of their Legislature with a Speech from the Throne.

These speeches to some considerable extent have been more of a formality than anything else, and are sometimes followed by elaborate addresses from both parties of the Governments concerned, more especially the Opposition Party.

A Speech from the Throne, sir, and the multiplication of words that sometimes come after it, is of very little account unless real actions follow.

This has been proven to a very large extent in the history of all Governments the world over, more especially the history of the Governments of this country, whose policies and actions in the past have not been of a very high order.

I think I am safe in saying that the policies of most all of the Governments of this country has been "Get all you can boys and ask no questions." A policy that is dreaded in every self-governing and civilized country in the world. This may appear to be strong language but nevertheless true to a very large extent. Past Governments in this country, sir, promised much and performed little. Look at the platform promises of past parties, look at their performances, look at the parties themselves, look at the neglected districts, look at the ignored petitions that my friend, Mr. Walsh, the Hon. Member for Placentia and St. Mary's, referred to the other day, and I am sure you will agree with me that things have gone very much awry in the past history of Newfoundland Governments.

Past Governments have practiced such things as trading in patronage, awarding contracts and buying supplies without open and honest competition and many other grafts and

scandals that have been so common.

Almost ever since Newfoundland has had Responsible Government we have been going on in practically the same old political rut.

For generations Governments have been elected and defeated, promises made and forgotten, statesmen have conjunction with cleverness, are men come and gone, elections have been lost and won, unscrupulous politicians and others who were after the Almighty dollar and self-aggrandizement have gone on hand in hand.

One Party has succeeded another in office for over eighty years and notwithstanding all the demands for reforms and all the beautiful promises made, and all the grand platforms drawn up when parties were in opposition. "Notwithstanding all these things," as one party succeeded another in office the new party coming into power didn't do very much to down the influence confronting it and forcing it to play the same old political tune on the same old political instrument in the same old political style and treat contracts and awards as rewards to be handed out to party workers.

The system has been an evil one, and one that has cost the country enormous sums of money.

It was simply this: "You scratch my back and I'll scratch yours."

There is another thing, Mr. Speaker, that has cost the country enormous sums of money as well to which I would like to refer briefly. That is the pure waste of public money on the eve of a general election in this country.

You know, sir, that it has been customary in the degrading politics of Newfoundland for Government candidates seeking election to the House of Assembly to appear before the electorate with the public funds of the Colony at their disposal, and to scatter these funds to the four winds of Heaven so to speak, North, South, East, and West, or any other course you like in order to catch votes.

This vote catching scheme has become an eye sore to the wealth producers of this country.

They are now wide awake to the fact that the hard-earned taxes that should be wisely expended to meet the pressing necessities and the requirements that they requested the Government for time and again have been squandered by sleek unscrupulous politicians on the eve of general elections. I am hoping, Mr. Speaker, that sometime in the near future a Bill will be brought down, passed, and placed on the Statute Book of this Dominion to the effect that any candidate seeking election to the House of Assembly who would so disgrace himself as to use the public funds of the Colony for political support, that that man whoever he may be, be put inside the walls of His Majesty's Penitentiary with oakum to pick or brooms to make until he repent in sackcloth and ashes. On the eve of a general election, Sir, is no time to expend public money, whether it would be expended economically or otherwise. If there is a surplus or a special grant to be utilized for public works, it should be expended at least six months before a general election takes place. I hope and trust, Mr. Speaker, that this waste of public monies, this vote-catching scheme, this ridiculous political bluff will cease now and forever more.

We are here now, Sir, in Legislative Session convened as standard bearers of a Liberal Reform Party, under the leadership of the Hon. R. A. Squires, whose manifesto is unequalled in the political history of this Dominion, and I hope and trust that each member of this Government will fully realize the meaning of the words **Liberal Reform,** "I repeat, Mr. Speaker, **Liberal Reform**" not in words only, but in ac-

tions. A Liberal Reform Party, Sir, is an absolute necessity. I daresay every man has done a considerable amount of thinking anent the former political situation of Newfoundland politics, and they are willing and ready to admit that there is ample room for improvement all along the political line, and that is what is needed to bring about reforms are men of sound moral character and real actions, instead of profession or cleverness. The good Book says "Faith without works is dead being alone." I think, Sir, that the writer might have added "Professions or cleverness without actions are dead also." Professions or cleverness is alright when not abused, and we give it all due respect, and fain would be the possessors, but when it leads a fellow to think that he is the cream of creation, the pink of perfection, the only pebble on the beach, then I say its wrong, and radically wrong and when it leads a fellow to appear before a constituency and appeal for votes on the ground be represented by a clever scoundrel than by a man of sound moral character and small ability, then I say it is ridiculously wrong. What the world needs to-day in business, politics and social life, are men who will do what is right, men of real actions instead of words, men of principle and honor instead of deception and bluff. The only absolute necessity in the politics of Newfoundland are men who are willing to put country first, constituents second, and self last. But sorry to say these kind of men in the politics of this Dominion in the past were few and far between. It was a very easy matter to find the man who was after the Almighty dollar and self aggrandizement. It was a very easy matter to find the fellow who posed as a political prophet, but who knew very little about the requirements of our people or what their grievances were. They apepared to be big political M.D.'s who knew all the ailments adjusted, and lots of other good of this country, and the remedy they prescribed in a great many instances was to send men to our Legislature who have passed with honors in the Universities of the world, men who would make black appear white, and white no color at all, men wtih their tongues hung in the middle—all bark and no bite. Character was never considered at all, or at least was always given a secondary consideration. Hence the absolute necessity for a Liberal Reform Party. What we need, Mr. Speaker, in our Legislature in conjunction with University training, in conjunction with cleverness, are men who will do what is right—men who will stand sentinel in the public interest. men who will take public monies into their custody and see that no wasteful expenditure is indulged in. men who will put laws on our Statute Book that will make the country a better place to live in, men who will present a Progressive Platform and then strive tooth and nail to have it put into effect, realizing at the same time that promising is one thing and performing is quite another. Men who will not tolerate wasteful expenditure which increases public debt to the extent of a camel on a cat's back, but rather do their very best to carry on the country's business in a thorough, economical and practical matter. I think such is the Liberal Reform Party.

Just one or two words, Mr. Speaker, in reference to the Fishery Regulations.

I read several letters of criticism to these regulations which were given publicity over nom de plume signatures in the Opposition press, which took no effect whatever; because I thought they were entirely partisan and written out of political spite, or the writers would have acted like men and come out over their own

signatures, instead of signing themselves this, that, and the other thing. And I may say, Sir, that I didn't take it for granted that what the editorials in these Opposition papers said concerning these regulations were all gospel truth, simply because I knew perfectly well that if these same identical regulations were introduced by Sir M. P. Cashin and his Party that these very same papers would be moving heaven and earth in lauding them up to the sky.

Just now, Mr. Speaker, I seem to be fully convinced that these much talked of Fishery Regulations will prove beneficial to our staple produce. My reason for thinking this is because I have obtained quite a lot of information from what I call a reliable source, especially from Mr. Coaker's notes on the conditions of the various fish markets that he had the opportunity of visiting, and from the grand speech which that honorable gentleman favoured this House with the other evening, which lead even some of the Opposition members to confess that what Mr. Coaker said concerning these regulations were absolutely correct.

I am sure, Sir, that the fishermen of this country ought to feel proud to have at the head of the Fisheries Department such a man as the Hon W. F. Coaker. Of course he has his faults, like all human beings; but we can't get away from the fact that ever since November 2nd, 1908, at Herring Neck when he began to show to the country his organizing ability and his desire to benefit Newfoundlanders, that he has done a service to this Dominion which has been already of immense good to it and which will in years to come prove the most beneficial transaction that any man or body of men ever bestowed upon this country and its hardy sons of toil.

I was going to say a few words on Education, Mr. Speaker, but I understand that the Hon. Dr. Barnes intends bringing down a Bill dealing with that important matter, so I will reserve my remarks for a later date.

In conclusion I wish to say that I am proud to be a standard-bearer of the Liberal Reform Party under the leadership of the Hon. R. A. Squires, and I believe, Sir, that many good things will be done under his administration. I believe that the high cost of living will be brought down; profiteers will be muzzled or put in the "pen"; the tariff will be somewhat things will be done. And I would like to say to honorable gentlemen on the other side of the House, if they don't believe it, just wait and see.

MR. GOSSE:—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in congratulating you on the high position in which you have been placed and I am all the more glad to see you so honored because you are a man of my own type, a fisherman. I also wish to congratulate my two friends sitting behind me, not only on their splendid speeches, but also on the active part they have played in the great war. After all, I do not give them much credit for this, because I consider that it was the duty of all young men who could to answer the call, and if I had been young enough I would have been there myself. I was sorry that I did not have a son old enough, but I had a nephew who spent three years in France.

Now Mr. Speaker, the position I find myself in to-night is one which I can hardly explain. It is my first time in the House of Assembly, and when I came here I expected to get some information, to hear something that would be edifying to us outport men and fishermen. You know, Sir, that the outport districts will not be represented by and by by anyone but fishermen, for these people know that straight honest outport men know better how to look after their interests

than St. John's lawyers, and moreover they will want no graft because even if they got the chance they would not know how to take it. You will pardon me, Mr. Speaker if I make any observations which might seem offensive, for I assure the honorable gentlemen on both this and the other side of the House that I have no intention whatever of saying anything of the kind. As I have previously said, when I came in here I expected to hear something edifying or interesting, but I am sorry to say my expectations in this respect were not fulfilled. I have listened to all the members on the Opposition side of the House criticise the Speech from the Throne, which I presume is their duty, and if I were in their place I would do the same.

When they had finished it came around to the Government side, and the members over here retaliated, and in this way we shall finish the month of April, spend the month of May and perhaps the most of June sitting here trying to get the business of the country settled up.

MINISTER OF SHIPPING:—Mr. Speaker, in common with my friends on this side of the House as well as with those on the other side, I would first like to extend my heartiest congratulations to you on attaining the highest position that the country could give you, namely, that of Chief Commoner. I do so particularly on account of your district being the next door neighbor of mine, knowing your interest in that part of the country, and that if there is anything that you are called upon to do to promote the welfare of the people of the district, you will be only too pleased to do it; and on behalf of the people of the district I extend my heartiest congratulations to you, for I feel sure, Sir, if any dispute arises with regard to the boundary line of the district of Carbonear and Bay de Verde, it will be settled amicably by ourselves without going to a higher tribunal.

It was not my desire to take part in the debate on the Speech from the Throne, as I have every confidence that the Speech from the Throne is well able to take care of itself. As I have said already it was not my intention to detain the House, but a foreign matter was introduced which there is no sense of reason in repeating over again or enlarging upon. I listened with a great deal of attention to the speeches made by gentlemen on the other side, and many of them I appreciated and thought well of. The speech from the Hon. member, Mr. Fox, was certainly a splendid effort. Especially was I struck with that part of his speech which some members on the Opposition side misconstrued. My only regret is that the hon. member, Mr. Fox had not delivered it some time before polling day. If he had, it would certainly have had a good effect, not only in St. John's, but also among the people in the outports. The address of Mr. Higgins was also an able one. Justice was done to himself and to the speech itself. I am sure I appreciated his effort very much indeed. I would also like to congratulate my hon. friend Mr. Bennett, for his able speech, if it was not for the fact that he introduced matters that were calamitous and unfortunate. Reference was made by him to the returned navy man who contested the district of Trinity and what he thought led to his defeat. In this connection I wish to say that there is no member on this side of the House or on the other side that has more reason to feel sore over this matter than I have. When Mr. Bennett was addressing the House and referred to the Trinity Bay affair, being somewhat new to parliamentary proceedings, I interrupted him saying I would take the opportunity to refer to the matter later.

But I feel sir, after all that has been dragged into this House, it is unwise to refer to this matter again. It is distasteful to me and to a man of any principle whatever. Any remark I may make I would like the hon. gentlemen on the opposite side to look upon it in the broadest sense, as I do not wish to be considered narrow. It is unfortunate for this country, that unlike other countries, we have no large questions to debate, such as tariff reform. The whole tenor of our questions is more or less local matter, and we are very apt to drag in matters that ought not to be drawn in when we are considering our country's interest.

There has been a lot of foreign matter brought in here these past few days, which I regard, and I believe the hon. members present regard also, as not being quite parliamentary. I will not refer to the matters which I have been accused of doing in the Bay de Verde district, as I feel sure that the members of this House are large enough and big enough to believe me when I say what I am accused of is absolutely false and there is no truth whatever in it. It is most unfortunate that in our political life the leaders of each party are surrounded by men who have no interest in the country, any more than what they can get out of it for themselves. These men have their very existence at stake during elections. They want to get something and are low enough to go to any depths or lengths to accomplish their ends. This is most unfortunate. The members of this House will see what I mean in this respect. They are associated with a party of men of a low type, with no honor, no principle, and with nothing in them which is essential to make a man. They are always ready to do anything and to act anything to bring their own ends about. I hope that the leaders of the Government and the Opposition will soon come to realize that all these tactics tend to their own destruction. There are those associated with them who impart to them unfortunate yarns which are false. Nobody feels more sorely about these stories than I do myself, for not only do I take it as an insult to me, but an insult has been cast upon eighteen thousand men of this country, ninety per cent. of whom are among our best citizens. The members on the other side, including Sir Michael Cashin, blame these reports for their defeat at the polls. This is not the case, and if Sir Michael is thinking that way he is thinking in the wrong direction.

SIR MICHAEY CASHIN:—What gave you that impression? Maybe you refer to the remarks of the member for St. John's West.

HON. MINISTER OF SHIPPING:—Well maybe the remarks were made by the hon. member for St. John's West. I am wrong. I thought something like that may be passing through Sir Michael's mind. If I am wrong I apologise. But as I said before, there were certain men who destroyed Sir Michael's party long before it was formed up. This may be rather a strange expression for me to make, but I think when you come to take into consideration the history and the political developments of this party for the last 12 months my hon. friends will say that what I state is true. Whatever reason there was or whatever motives the honorable gentlemen had in passing the vote of want of confidence in themselves does not interest me. This is a matter on which I am not very well informed, but what I want to refer to is the formation of the party after the dissolution of parliament, and I will say this, if Sir Michael's best adviser, Sir John, had been in the country, probably a different thing would have happened. In the formation of that party they got

round them men who were sufficient to secure their own destruction. For the proof of this you have only to refer to the article which appeared in the Daily News and The Telegram dealing with Mr. Bennett and the Department of Militia, and what these papers did when my friend Sir John Crosbie was acting Premier of this country. These papers went throughout the country, yet when the Government was formed it took into its bosom these men who had already destroyed the party. If the statements made were true, they did not further the reputation of the party, as the result showed. When they took these men the country became suspicious, and I venture to say that if Sir Robert Bond had done the same thing, although he is a man of such wide prominence and splendid reputation, the result would have been the same as that which happened Sir Michael. Sir Michael, your party was destroyed by the very friends who helped to form it?

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Is that Mr. Cave's opinion?

HON. MINISTER OF SHIPPING:—That is my opinion, Sir Michael, or your party and all the members of which it is composed will bear me out. Anyway it is now time for us to forget what has happened and to get down to work and to do something for the benefit of the people of Newfoundland. I firmly believe that the newspapers are no benefit in a political campaign. The only news one cares to read is the foreign extracts.

SIR JOHN CHOSBIE:—Mr. Cave, do you refer to all the papers?

HON. MINISTER OF SHIPPING:—Yes; my statement refers to all the papers without any exceptions. The only news fit to read is what comes from foreign parts. In the Bay de Verde district campaign the only paper we saw was the Daily News, and, in writing to my friends in the city, I told them to keep from the district all other papers, as the Daily News contained all the campaign matter that was needed. Every item in that paper was against us, but it brought votes our way. I think it is about time that we were doing something beneficial for the country and letting the people have a clear idea of the country's position.

The tactics adopted by the leaders of political parties remind me of the kaiser. He had secret service men throughout the country. They brought to him information that England was doing so and so and that she was going to be crushed out of existence. They influenced the old man's mind so that he at last became nutty over it to such an extent that he set the world on fire by declaring war. This is what has taken place in public life. Secret service men carry false information to their leaders and then certain tactics are adopted which terminate in disaster.

There are one or two remarks which the Leader of the Opposition made the other day to which I would like to refer. He referred to me as a pretty nice spectacle. I will really forgive Sir Michael for that, as I rather think he was laboring under a very great strain, and in the heat of debate he probably said things that he is now sorry for.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—No, I am not.

HON. MINISTER OF SHIPPING:—I thought you were a broader man than that. I am sorry. I do not make any objection as it rather amused me when Sir Michael stated from the other side of the House that I was a pretty nice spectacle in the Shipping Department. This is a matter to which I do not wish to reply. When I came to this Department Sir Michael forgot that there were only three men fit for the position—Sir Michael, Sir John and myself. Now it was impossible for the Prime Minister to induce Sir Mi-

chael to take the position of Minister of Shipping, and Sir John would not honor us with his services, then surely all will admit, including Sir John, that the only thing left for the Prime Minister to do was to get the next best man, and Sir Michael will admit after all that I am an ice spectacle. Now, I do not wish this to be taken as sarcasm.

There were certain statements made by myf riend which were not correct, and I think he must have been misinformed. There are one or two extracts in the Daily News report of Sir Michael's speech, and if they are incorrect I should like my friend to inform me.

Referring to Minister of Shipping, Sir Michael was pleased to say that there was not a knob of coal in town. At the time he was speaking the Prospero was unloading 400 tons, and not only that, but Mr. T. A. Bown held in stock 450 tons, making a total of 850 tons in the city at that time. Sir Michael could not have been in possession of facts when he made the statement. He referred to industrial places being held up through lack of coal. We have kept enough on hand to supply those places because of the labouring class who would be seriously affected by the closing down of industry. He said that the minister did not know where to get enougn coal to bunker the steamers that were going to Sydney. There were four steamers in the harbor fully bunkered at the time the hon. member of the Opposition was speaking. They were held up because of the demands of the firemen. These steamers have sailed since without taking a knob of coal out of the city supply. He also said that the Minister of Shipping did not know where to charter a steamer to bring coal. The fact is a steamer was chartered, but circumstances arose over which neither the hon. leader of the Opposition nor the Minister of Shipping had control, and which made it impossible for the charterer to carry out the charter. The steamer met with an accident which detained her. Other steamers which were promised were held up by strikes in foreign parts. Th most uncalled for remark was when the hon. member said that we were wasting time with the Jobs of New York. No time was wasted with that firm. I have no doubt that the hon. leader of the Opposition had reference to an article in the Daily News of a little time ago in which they referred to the Jobs running the Shipping Department. Sir John Crosbie asked for certain information which was tabled. The next morning it appeared in the Daily News. We were trying to do everything possible to relieve the situation, and had no time to waste with any one particular firm.

At the time referred to the hon. member will remember there was lying in our port one of the steamers belonging to the United States Shipping Board, which we were unable to bunker without greatly depleting our stocks We were anxious to assist this steamer and took the matter up with the Shipping Board, and tried to induce them to send one of their steamers here with a cargo of coal. To show our sincerity in the matter we offered to take half the cargo which we would have to sell at a loss, as we could not ask the people to pay $23.00 per ton, when we were getting coal from Sydney and selling it for $15.00. At the same time Messrs. Job & Co., of New York, offered a steamer of about 3300 tons. Our proposition for this steamer was that she would take on board 1000 tons of gas coal and 500 tons to bunker the Hurion, the balance of the cargo we would take over for the city. The Gas Company did not get the permit through in time to avail of the steamer and the Shipping Board abandoned the idea of

sending down the coal. So that the proposition had reference only to the Gas Co. and bunker coal for the Hurion.

The Gas Co. requires a special quality of coal, used only for gas purposes, and they should import their own supplies. The Minister of Shipping has no more right to furnish the Gas Company with coal, than he has to supply any manufacturing concern in the city with raw material.

Another statement to which I want to refer was that the management has been incompetent since Sir John Crosbie retired. I do not want to bring in any personal criticism, but it is a fact that Sir John was evidently unable to get coal to carry on his own business, although he had the supplying of the public institutions.

He could not get coal to provide these institutions with and had to go out of business, leaving these institutions on our hands to add to our difficulties. If it were possible for him to get the coal to supply these institutions he would not have thrown the responsibility over on us. There were many difficulties which confronted us when I came into office, the least of which was not the coal position, with little or no stocks in town and the winter commencing six weeks earlier than usual.

In order to feel safe and be assured of sufficient winter supply 20,000 tons of coal should have been imported during the latter part of October and the first of November. When we came into office stocks were very low in the city and we were compelled to enforce regulations as Sir John Crosbie had done in order to keep our fuel supply going. My honorable friend, the Leader of the Opposition has said that if the Minister of Shipping has had the courage to ask Sir John Crosbie to help him out the situation would have been saved. I hope, Sir, that the day will never come when circumstances will arise which will put me in that position. It may be news to the Leader of the Opposition that Sir John is one of my best friends and that I am always at liberty to walk in and take a seat in his office at any time.

Sir Michael said that when he was in Halifax there were seventeen ships there open for charters. If he refers to his visit in February I might say that there was no need for us at that time to charter any vessels as we had arrangements made whereby our supply was provided for up to the first of May, and if the contract had been carried out all would have gone well. If he refers to his visit in March then all I can say, Sir, is that if these seventeen vessels were there they must have been well camouflaged, and only he was specially privileged to visit them, for I would inform this House that we had prominent brokers in Halifax on the lookout there for just such charters, and Major Montgomerie who was invited to co-operate with us in the effort to secure tonnage, assured us that he tried his best and failed. We also had ten or twelve brokers in New York whose efforts to procure steamers for us were equally fruitless. I am not asking him to take my word for it. He can go to the Shipping Department and look through the correspondence that he will find there in relation to this matter.

Sir Michael further stated that he had spoken to the manager of the Dominion Iron and Steel Co., who told him that there was no difficulty in getting supplies. I presume Sir Michael meant tonnage, and if that is so I would like to state that not so very long ago we applied, not only to the Sydney office of the Dominion Co., but also to their Montreal office and to the president himself in an endeavour to secure tonnage, but to no avail. This will also be borne out by the

correspondence on file in the Shipping Office.

He goes on to say that the Minister of Shipping had not made the slightest effort to relieve the coal situation. I do not think, Sir, that he was justified in making this statement unless he had the prooff in his hands. He was also in error when he said that coal was being doled out in quarter ton lots at the rate of $20.00 per ton. How is this possible, if as Sir Michael alleges, there is not a knob of coal in town? He is also inaccurate as regards the price, which has not yet reached $20.00 per ton sold in quarters, on which the cartage is materially higher than on tons and half tons.

Sir Michael is also incorrect when he states that during the war period coal did not reach more than $15.00 per ton. If the hon. Leader of the Opposition believes that statement to be true, then I must say that he bought no coal during the war period. The price reached during the war and which held for a considerable time was $17.00 per ton. It dropped to $15.00 simply because freight rates dropped $2.00. The price is regulated first by the prime cost of the article. which since January has advanced $1.35, exclusive of trimmings, second by the cost of freighting which has advanced about $2.00, thirdly by the cost of handling which had advanced about 40 c., making a total of $3.75 per ton, and would justify coal being sold at $18.75 per ton without increasing retailer's profits over those allowed by the late Minister of Shipping.

Mr. Speaker, I make these statements not merely to justify my position, but to inform the hon. member of the Opposition that he has been misinformed.

MR. BROWNRIGG:—Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer you my heartiest congratulations on the very great dignity conferred upon you by the men sitting on the left of your chair, and I am sure after your retirement from this office twenty or twenty-four years from now you will hand down to your successors as much honour and integrity as was left by any of your predecessors, who held this high office and important position. I wish also to offer my hearty congratulations to the hon. and gallant member for Burgeo and LaPoile, and the hon. and gallant member for Bay de Verde on their very able speeches on the Address in Reply from the Speech from the Throne. I feel certain that these hon. and gallant members, representing the two important districts that they do, will play the game of statesmanship with as much gallantry and dignity as they played the manly and noble game of soldiering.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words in answer to some of the charges that have been made against me by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. Sir Michael Cashin has stated in this House that I would be fighting under his banner, and if elected, occupying a seat under his leadership, if he had promised me the position of Minister of Finance and Customs, with his party if successful at the polls. If parliamentary etiquette would allow me to deny this charge in more forcible language than it allows I would do so. All I can say is that that statement is absolutely incorrect and unless the hon. Leader of the Opposition makes an affidavit that his statement was correct then he must lie under the charge of deliberately lying. I neither asked nor sought for any departmental office from the Leader of the Opposition when he interviewed me to contest in the interests of his party the district of St. John's West. When Sir Michael Cashin tendered his many friends an invitation to a dinner given by him at Smithville a few years ago he sent

me an invitation, I declined same and would not accept his hospitality. At that time a great number of citizens were aware of this fact and some of them commented very strongly on my attitude. However, I had my own personal reasons for declining the invitation. In fact, I would not go to "Dinty Moore's with the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. I neither sought nor asked an interview with Sir Michael Cashin over political matters. The intermediary that was acting in the interests of Sir Michael Cashin and trying to use his influence in getting me to go out under the banner of the gentleman opposite can verify these facts.

I was always a supoprter of the Liberal Party under the leadership of the late Sir William Whiteway, and the Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Bond. During my residence in the West End Sir Edward Morris contested the district under Sir Robert Bond and I voted for that gentleman and used my influence on his behalf, but when Sir Edward Morris, now Lord Morris, saw fit to break from that party then my interest ceased in the interests of that party that he came to the country with as leader. It would therefore be very inconsistent for me to break away from that great Liberal Party at a time that I was certain they were to be elected in the contest that was about to take place. In fact, during a conversation with my hon. friend the member for St. John's East, Mr. Vinnicombe, who will remember well that one day after a meeting of the Municipal Council we were talking over political matters, I told him that if he wanted to be on the winning side he should try and get with whatever party would oppose the late government. However, he did not take my advice and I think he will give me credit for knowing or at least for having some knowledge of who would be the winners in the contest that took place last year.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform this House that the hon. member for St. John's East, Mr. Higgins, asked my brother if I would not contest St. John's East with him in the interests of the late government under the leadership of Sir Michael Cashin, and the answer that was given Mr. Higgins was "there was nothing doing." With these facts I think it is unnecessary for me to say any more as to how my sentiments were running, and in pointing out to you who I thought would be the better party in the interests of this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to explain about another charge brought forward in this House at yesterday's sitting by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. Sir Michael Cashin came into this yesterday and from a paper read to this House the hardship that was imposed on Mr. John Brazil, late tidewaiter on the s.s. Fiona in being discharged from the Customs Department. The facts are: On my taking over the office of Minister of Finance and Customs I found several men in that Department who were drawing fairly large salaries and giving no returns whatever to the country. Amongst them Mr. Brazil, of Renews, who I understand is a strong supporter of Sir Michael Cashin. This gentleman was drawing from the Customs Department $824.00 per annum and also $1.00 per day, board money when not on steamer, which was very often and his work consisted of going to bed and getting up again. This was the only return that Mr. Brazil was giving to this country for the salary he was receiving. When I heard these facts I told the Sub-Collector, Mr LeMessurir, that such occurrence in this Department should cease immediately, and informed him to notify Mr. Brazil that his services were no longer required. As to the date of the

notification of Mr. Brazil's dismissal, it did not enter my mind. I was unaware, until Sir Michael Cashin read it to this House, that this gentleman had been dismissed on one or two days notice. It was not my intention to treat Mr. Brazil in such a manner, a thirty days notice, and if Mr. Brazil had seen me about this matter I would have arranged to have him paid one month's salary, which I think he was entitled to. I would ask the hon. member for St. John's East, Mr. Fox, if I have not already done this very thing as British fair play at least demands with another supporter of the late government, who resides in the West End and has been dismissed by me on the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission appointed by the late government, because he was incompetent in the performance of the duties that he was supposed to fulfill.

If I were vindictive and wanted to come back at the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, there is not one man occupying government positions in Ferryland district under my jurisdiction, or in fact under any other Government Department that would not be dismissed for supporting the hon. the Leader of the present Opposition.

I would like to point out another case that was on my answer paper to the question of the junior member for Ferryland district, Mr. Moore. Mr. Stephen Hall of Codroy, was employed as a customs official travelling back and forth from Sydney and ports of call on the West Coast this year. Every trip he was on that boat this country had to pay Mr. Farquhar, the owner, his passage back and forth, his board money when on her and when ashore we had to pay him $1.00 per day, for his upkeep, and mind you, Mr. Speaker, this man could not give one cent returns to this country in the position that he held because a steamer when coming into port must enter through the customs official in that particular place. This, Mr. Speaker, is only one of the few in which government offices were handled during these late years, and where would it stop if the majority of people, in their wisdom, had not concluded that it was time for a change.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:— Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to say a few words briefly before the motion passes. I may say that the artillery preparation that has been going on for the last two days will be stopped. Zero will be when I sit down, and the Prime Minister will deliver our counter attack, and I hope he will attain his objective. I joined with others the other day in congratulating you on your appointment. I now wish to sympathize with you as well, because I think you have a record. You are the only one in my experience who so soon after the opening has had two of his rulings questioned and put to the vote of the House. I think we have a House in which every member is quite capable of looking after himself, and the debating power is certainly a record. I would like to single out a couple of members for personal reasons. One is Mr. Scammell, hon. member for St. Barbe, because I think for a junior member of this House he has made one of the best maiden speeches I have ever heard in this Assembly and he is a credit to the House. Mr. Fox is another because he is a pupil of mine. He studied law with me, and I have watched his career with interest. I hope in the course of time the predictions made for him will be fulfilled, and I may say I think he is a decided asset to the House.

While, Sir, I congratulate the various gentlemen, at the same time I have to deprecate one speech made to the motion before the chair and that was the speech of the honorable member

for Ferryland, Mr. Moore. I suppose the hon. Mr. Moore considers that his well known war activities gives him the right to attack some of the officials of this House and to sneer at men who wear rejection badges. Any man who entered that armoury and volunteered with the full and firm conviction that, as far as he knew, he was going to lay down his life, but was not so fortunate as those who went across to the other side, did all that was humanly possible for him to do. The Great War Veterans' Association and the men who went over and fought and were wounded recognize that fact. Numbers of rejected men are members of the G.W.V.A. and I say that it does not become any member, I do not care who he is, to sneer at any man because he was not at the front if he has offered so to do.

I would like to point out to the younger members on this side of the House advisedly I may say, that it is eighteen years ago since I won my first election, although you may not notice any gray hairs in my head. It is 17 years since I first sat in this House and I want you to believe that, with the exception of the Leader of the Opposition, who is the father of the House, though I cannot call myself his step-father, I am his nearest relation, I am senior and he is the only member in the House to-day who sat here before I did. I only hope that he will continue to be the father of the House for some years yet, and that he will find his present chair very comfortable.

Hon. members on the other side, I think nearly all of them remarked that there was absolutely nothing in the Speech from the Throne. As we have been here now over ten days discussing it, it really does look as if the Executive Council put something in it. Our hon. friend, Capt. Gosse objects to being here until June, but if the Speech from the Throne that contained nothing occupied over ten days, then if it contained something he would be here until October next. When listening to the speeches from the other side, I could not help thinking how the Leader of the Government who had been in office for ten years had been waiting to have an opportunity afforded him to criticize somebody else's Speech from the Throne. I have sat in opposition when the present leader of the Opposition was on this side.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—But I always managed to get back.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—But when I did come back I came on the Government side every time. I have seen Speeches from the Throne torn to shreds by the Opposition party at that time. We were always glad to have the opportunity. I want to warn younger members on this side that it is all part and parcel of parliamentary life.

When the hon. member for Fogo was speaking, he referred to the fact that the present government had the largest majority ever given to any government in this Island. It was questioned by the other side. Now I have had complied a few figures that I think may be of interest to hon. members. The biggest majority previous to this one was in the year 1900 when Sir Robert Bond came back with thirty-two members against four for the Opposition, the latter having three seats in Bonavista, and one in Port de Grave. The total votes cast for Bond candidates was 51,657 against 29,267 for the Opposition, but at that time there were independents in the field as follows: one in St. Barbe, one in Ferryland, one in Hr. Main, another in Placentia and another in St. John's East. The total vote against Bond was 30,809. The majority for Bond was 22,390, which was the biggest up to that time. In 1904 Bond was again

returned to power and came back with a party of thirty members. The vote cast for Bond candidates was 52,932 against 34,662 for the Opposition, giving a majority of 18,170 or four thousand of a majority less than what he got in 1900. The next big majority was secured by the leader of the present government. In November last Squires and his party polled 72,687 against 21,330 for the Opposition which gave the Government, as Mr. Hibbs said, a record majority of 51,-157. It is no wonder then, Sir, that Opposition members have taken the earliest opportunity since this House opened to criticise the Government. They have four years ahead of them, working overtime, to try and reduce that majority.

Referring to the Labrador Boundary question, I think I would be ungenerous and uncouth if I did not thank the hon. members who so wisely referred to me in connection with this matter. I appreciate it and hope that their confidence will not be misplaced. This question, which has been looming up over and over again, will, I hope be decided within the next eighteen months. It may be of interest to know something about that, because it is a question that means a great deal to Newfoundland it we can get our proper share of Labrador. This dispute has been going on now since 1903. I think hon. members on the other side will agree that for some time it has been referred to in the Speech from the Throne. It must be remembered in dealing with this question that we are up against a large propostion in many ways, but the chief one is this, that Newfoundland is a small country, its influence is small, it has a small population and in fighting its battles against the Dominion of Canada, which is so big, powerful and influential, it is natural to suppose that share of the Labrador peninsula given to the Province of Quebec will be large. Legal gentlemen handling the case up to this time had in view. The late Mr. M. W. Furlong gave a lot of time and attention to this matter. He protested from the first that there was to be no question to be submitted to the Privy Council, which would enable them to arrive at a decision, except purely on points of law, and that is why the question is going on without being settled. The Dominion wanted to have the question submitted to the Privy Council in this form: "Please define boundary line between Newfoundland and Quebec in the Labrador Peninsula." The late Mr. Furlong stuck out against this and consistently asked that the terms of reference be "What is the boundary line between Quebec and Newfoundland in Labrador under the law." In order that there should be no outside influence brought to bear upon the Privy Council, we have all the time taken the position that that boundary line must be determined according to law. The late government agreed upon the terms of reference to be submitted to the Privy Council, but something has been done since I have assumed the position of Attorney General. We have agreed that the terms of reference will be submitted in this way: "What is the boundary line between Quebec and Newfoundland on the Labrador peninsula according to statutes, proclamations and orders in council." To carry out and maintain our position solicitors on the other side agree that the Privy Council will be guided by law only in dealing with the question. That is the present position. We have agreed and Canada has agreed and now we are discussing the exchange of pleas. I may say that we have retained the finest lawyer in the United Kingdom in the person of Sir John Simon, who

was Attorney General of Great Britain in the Asquith administration and with him a prominent barrister on the other side named Mr. Barrington Ward, K.C. This question will not be decided this summer, but we have so far arrived at the question to be submitted to the Privy Council. Arguments will be submitted on behalf of Canada and on behalf of Newfoundland. For the purpose of preparing our arguments for our counsel in England, I propose to go to England after the closing of the legislature, so that we can have an opportunity of exchanging views before the case goes for trial. But our cases will not be exchanged before the expiration.

In conclusion there is one matter on which I would like to touch. It is a subject which I am glad was brought up I think, by the honorable member for St. John's East, Mr. Fox. This is a subject upon which I think I can speak with a certain amount of authority. I refer to the suggestions made here that voters which put us here were influenced by the particular altar at which they kneel. Now there is a certain section of the people who are using this sectarianism which only consist of whispers and hints from one to the other. People never saw anything about it in the papers until recently and the matter was not heard in this House until the honorable member for St. John's East broached the subject and I am glad he did. And I say this discussion has done a lot of good. It will help to choke the serpent that goes about in the dark and which is sapping the energies of those who want to do something for our country. Now I know that there are certain Protestants who think the Roman Catholics are using the sectarian cry, and I know that there are certain Roman Catholics who think the Protestants are using the sectarian cry. Well there are a certain number of people in each denomination who think this, but they carry on their work by whispering behind their opponents backs. Now, Sir, we ought to let these people know that they are not going to do any good,they are not getting us into the House by means of the sectarian city.

There are some good men in this House who would rather not be here at all if their means of getting here were the use of the sectarian cry. But those men are going to stamp out such a vile matter. We are here to do some good for our country. We are not in this House to represent any particular religion. We are here in this House for the state. The country needs the best of our energies. There are no Catholics or Protestant seats in the Upper House. No person who goes into the Upper House goes into it as a Roman Catholic or a Protestant. They go there to further the interests of the country they live in. The seats in the Upper House belong to the state just as those do in the Lower House.

Some days ago the honorable member for St. John's West protested against two Roman Catholics being given two Protestant seats in the Upper House. If any denomination has not got its representation we are not to be blamed. This sectarianism wastes our efforts, it wastes our energies. I hope that now that we have expressed our views we will have finished with it. Now, Sir, we have got to pull together and do our duty to the state and not hate one another for the love of God. As I think it is very apt, Sir, I wish to quote a few words from the pen of J. B. O'Rielly, or Wendell Philips.

"Come workers, here was a teacher,
and the lesson he taught was good,

There are no classes or races, but one human brotherhood;

There are no creeds to be outlawed, no colours of skin debarred,

Mankind is one in its rights and wrongs, one hope, one right, one guard?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.— Mr. Speaker,may I first be permitted to express to this House my hearty congratulations and to the country a word of good cheer on the very high .verage o debating ability which this Chamber has evidenced during the past ten days. To both the Government and the Opposition benches a word of sincere appreciation has to be extended. I am sure I may be permitted having already feliciated the honourable and gallent gentlemen who moved and seconed the motion for the appointment of a select committee to convey a special word of congratulation to the junior member of the Government Party, Mr. Scammell for the particularly eloquent effort with which he impromptu dealt with the matter of public importance which came within the scope of his address and also the Leader of the Oppossition my hearty Congratulations for having within his ranks a gentleman whose maiden speech in this House showed the possession of considerable debating ability. It is an augury of good future for Newfoundland when in a new Legislature the debating strength is of such high average, the independence, dignity and strength of purpose so marked, the fearlessness with which public matters have been approached so much in evidence, and there is added the touch of true oratory from both the Government and Opposition sides of the House.

I look forward, Sir, to seeing some of the younger men of this Chamber taking prominent places as the years go by as independent men and gentlemen, as gladiators for the truth, well worthy of the honor which the electors of our Ancient Colony have conferred in giving them seats in this Chamber.

It is not often, Sir, out of the hundreds of times which it has been my privilege to rise in the course of debate or on public platforms that I have felt the great personal hesitation and regret which I do at this moment, because to me the approach of personalities in debate is most grossly distasteful; but, Sir, the Leader of the Opposition was pleased in the course of his remarks to make certain personal references to which I feel it my duty to this House to make reply. And the first, Sir, is the most unpleasant one of all. Here I would quote the words of Mr. Cave, the Acting Minister of Shipping: "Secret Service men often carry false information," and attacks, particularly such fierce personal attacks as the Leader of the Opposition was pleased to make upon myself, are very often based, honestly in intention but falsely in fact, upon the false information which such Secret Service men carry to their leaders. I refer at this moment to the suggestion made by the Leader of the Opposition, when he said that a public meeting held in the Majestic Theatre I deliberately singled out the name of one of Newfoundland's most estimable young ladies in the person of his daughter, Miss Mary Cashin, for personal attack. I am glad that the Leader of the Opposition made the statement in this Chamber, because it gives me an opportunity of publicly making an absolute denial. If Sir Michael Cashin had been present at that meeting he would not be under the impression to which he gave expression.

In making that charge against me,

I hope Sir, that he idd it honestly believing that the charge was true, but there are in this Chamber tonight nany men who were present at that Majestic Theatre meeting and know that no person was singled out for personal attack, much less that any attack was made upon Miss Mary Cashin to the effect that she received from her father the Minister of Finance the sum of $1,500, $2,000, $2,-400 or whatever the amount was, in a false, fraudulent or improper manner. The fact was this; Sir Michael was pleased to publish a letter over his own signature in some Opposition paper, and in it refer to the Minister of Finance, Mr. Brownrigg, and ask that he secure from the Department of Finance and Customs certain particulars in connection with the cost of a certain loan concerning which the Minister of Finance had made some public criticism. These particulars were secured and handed to me on the platform of the Majestic Theatre and were read. No name was omitted from the list given me, and no name was added by me. Unfortunately, Sir Michael was informed that I mentioned his daughter's name only and criticised that one name only. Those who were present know that I read a list of names, and the best evidence I have that I read a list is that two persons in St. John's, neither of them the one to whom Sir Michael referred, and one being Mr. Paddon, Manager of the Bank of Montreal, asked me why I read the name of the Bank of Montreal from the list. Mr. Paddon said they were regular brokers and that the transaction with them was in the ordinary course of their business as bankers and brokers and not any special business, as was the case with certain other names, and he did not think the Bank's name should have been read with the others. Personal attack, Sir, is a thing which I despise. Political battles may be fought, and fought fiercely without any combatant degrading himself to the baseness of personal calumny. I know how Sir Michael was feeling; I know how I felt when in the "Telegram" there was a personally abusive article attacking my father; I know how I felt when in a certain other paper there was a vile and most offensive personal attack upon my wife; I know how Sir John Crosbie must have felt when some months ago there was a personal attack upon some of his family, and insofar as any references were made thereto in any Government paper I express to him my sincere regret. It is entirely contrary to my own personal feelings and to the program and policy of the Government that personal discourtesies should be injected into public debate or print.

The next matter to which I would refer and I mention this too with feelings of sorrow, was also introduced by Sir Michael into his addresses on two occasions, frst on the opening day, and later in his lengthly speech on the motion which is now before the House. I refer to what is known as the "Lornina Inquiry." Sir Michael was pleased to say that in connection with that inquiry I had stabbed him in the back. I believe that he thinks I did. I do not think for one moment that he would have made that statement if he did not believe it, but, again quoting the words of the Acting Minister of Shipping, "The Secret Service men carry false information." The entire facts in connection with that matter are within my own personal knowledge and clear memory. The suggestion that there was any attempt on behalf of Sir Ewward, now Lord Morris, or myself to injure a colleague of the Executive of that day is absolutely without any foundation whatever in fact. I am as perfectly satisfied that Lord Morris, who was then bitterly attacked by Sir Michael Cashin in connection with that

matter and who has since been bitterly pursued by him in connection therewith, was free from any suggestion of an attempt to play falsely as that I am now addressing the House upon this most unpleasant topic. Every detail of the transaction is within my knowledge, burned into my memory because of the fact that I have realized time after time from the conversations of friends of mine who were also friends of the Knight who is Leader of the Opposition that there was that feeling of bitter resentment and most hostile personal antagonism on the part of Sir Michael Cashin towards myself which any man might naturally feel towards another if that other, being an Executive colleague, should descend to such infamy as that of attempted political assassination. I am glad that Sir Michael has given me the opportunity of publicly refuting the suggestion that Lord Morris or myself was identified in any way whatever with any attempt to do him political injury.

There is one other matter, Sir, with which I must now deal, and I do so merely because it too was included within the scope of the attack of the Leader of the Opposition upon me, and that is the charge with which the name of my friend and colleague, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, was identified several years ago. Sir Michael was pleased to read from the records of the Legislative Council the circumstances under which as a gladiator for the party for which I stood I fought against the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries as vigorously as I knew how; he also read the record of how my then opponent, the gladiator now sitting on my right, fought against me with all his vigor. Of these records neither of us is in the least degree ashamed. The line of our conflict and the clash of arms have been borne throughout the length and breadth of the country, and have found prominent places in the Hanzards of both branches of the Legislature. We are both proud of the vigour of our fight, and now, having laid aside all personal differences, each appreciates the other all the more because of the strenuous conflict of the past. We have joined our fighting forces in the interest of the Homeland which we both dearly love, and for the advancement of which we will give our life's best efforts. The Leader of the Opposition has already had reason to realize our fighting powers, and can appreciate the strength we can put behind our common cause, the welfare of our country. The majority of 31,157, the largest majority ever secured in this country by any Government, is evidence of the truth of which I speak.

As to the insinuations honestly made by Mr. Coaker some years ago, repeated a few days ago by Mr. Fox in this Chamber, reiterated by Sir Michael Cashin on yesterday, to the effect that in the autumn of 1917, when Colonial Secretary of this Colony, I received from Mr. H. D. Reid the sum of $5,000 as a bribe to affect my attitude towards the Reid Newfoundland Company in the matter of certain claims then pending, I again quote the words of my honourable friend, the Acting Minister of Shipping, "The Secret Service men carry false information." When Sir Edward Morris became Attorney General I was associated with him in the practice of law, and the very first thing he did when he took office was to close his records in connection with various large matters he was previously handling for the Reid Newfoundland Company. Some time after that I was retained by that company in connection with these matters. When I became Attorney General in 1914 I wrote the President of the Reid Newfoundland Company informing him that my acceptance of public office meant the cessa-

tion of professional relationships with the company. For some time previously, through the courtesy of one of the Company's accountants some of the collection business for the Electric Light Department, Dry Dock and the Angel Engineering and Supply Company, Ltd., came to my office to be handled in the same way as similar business from any other firm on Water Street. Within a few weeks after I became Attorney General a circular was sent around by me to these debtors informing them that the accounts for the Reid Newfoundland Company would be closed, and as soon as possible thereafter this business was wound up. There has been no transaction between the Reid Newfoundland Company or anybody connected with it and myself, the firm of Squires & Winter, or any of my associates, friends or relatives, directly or indirectly, with the exception of the items to which I have referred, from which I or my firm or my associates, friends or relatives have derived any profit or advantage from the Reid Newfoundland Company to the value of a two cent postage stamp. On behalf of clients I have had business dealings with the Reid Newfoundland Company, but under no circumstances did I represent the Reids or any of their outfit or associates. My fees were charged to the people whom I represented and were paid by them and not by the Reids directly or indirectly. No fee was ever charged by me in connection with any of these transactions to the Reid Newfoundland Company, nor was any share, commission or any other consideration paid me by the Reids in connection therewith. I had no personal interest of any kind in any business dealings with the Reid Newfoundland Company, nor did any of my friends, associates or relatives, from which any profit or benefit directly or indirectly accrued to me or them from the Reid Newfoundland Company or any of the Reids or any of their connections. Not only have I not acted in a professional capacity for the Reids, but I have not been a shareholder in any timber grants, mining properties, water powers, licenses or any other Government concessions of any sort whatever at any time in connection with any business associated with the Reid Newfoundland Company. I am proud, Sir, of my clear-cut, straight public record in my relations, professional, commercial and otherwise, with the Reid Newfoundland Company and every other Company since the year 1908 when I first entered public life in this Colony.

I would now refer, Sir, to that contemptible thing which the lengthy debate in this House has done much to kill in this country—sectarianism. In 1908, then a law partner of Sir Edward Morris, I as a Methodist stood as a candidate for him for a Methodist seat in the District of Trinity. He was a Roman Catholic, but that did not affect my attitude in the least. I did the best that lay within my power for him and the policy for which his party stood. The leader of the Trinity team, Hon. Robert Watson, was elected. Mr. Stone and I were defeated. That was the "tie" election. In the following spring there was another general election. Again I gave my best as a party man in the fight for the cause of my Roman Catholic leader, and was proud of him as the brainiest, most capable leader with whom I had been personally identified in Newfoundland's public affairs. I was successful, as were also my two colleagues.

In 1913 I went back to the electoral District of Trinity under my Roman Catholic leader to fight against the forces of the Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Bond, associated with that invincible Northern fishermen's organization, the Fishermen's Protective Union,

and by the wonderful personal prestige of Sir Robert Bond, combined with the strength of that organization in the District of Trinity under the Presidency of the gentleman who is the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I was defeated by a large majority.

As a Methodist I fought under my Roman Catholic leader, glad to go to defeat for him and his party; a defeat which was recognized as being sure and decisive before I announced my candidacy for the constituency. As was anticipated, I came back defeated. Two members of the late Executive Council, now sitting in opposition to me, have done me the deliberate discourtesy of saying that it was through their grace that Sir Edward Morris offered me the portfolio of Justice and a seat in the Legislative Council. They may now say that; I know otherwise.

Unlike certain other members of the party, I went to my constituency to face certain defeat after a fierce fight, with no suggestion as to any consideration. I went as a party man, not as a hireling. I paid my own one-third share of the campaign expenses of our three candidates, and provided my own motor yacht for the party. I was fighting for the cause of a man whose bigness of heart and brain commanded my devotion.

Some little time after my defeat Sir Edward Morris sent for me to meet him at his residence, and he then offered me the Department of Justice. I declined, saying that I could not afford to take it. I told him that I would appreciate an Executive seat without portfolio, but a Department I could not take, for the simple reason that I could not afford to practically abandon my large law practice for the income of the Department of Justice. Some days later he sent for me again, and I again declined. At a later interview he asked me, in the interests of the party which I had served to take the Department of Justice. He took the position that it was essential in the party interests, as he wished to complete his Executive and Departmental offices strictly along denominational lines, and there was not a Protestant constituency he dared open.

Why, let me inquire, was it impossible for hom to open a Protestant constituency to elect an Attorney General? Because The Evening Telegram newspaper, opposed to him then as it is opposed to me now, had then, just as it is doing now, paraded sectarianism. If the honorable members will refer to the files of The Evening Telegram of the winter of 1913-14 they will find a series of most virulent attacks on Sir Edward Morris because he was a Roman Catholic. Look at the present sectarian contents of its columns. The same old paper at the same old game—preaching sectarianism and attempting to inflame the people this way or that just as its contemptible management feels it can manipulate religious sensibilities best to its own advantage.

The courtesy, Sir, was not extended by Messrs. Cashin and Bennett to me as they would have this House now believe. Rather was it a sacrifice made by me at the call of my leader and a courtesy extended to them to stabilitate the Executive administration of the day at very considerable financial sacrifice to myself. Any man who has occupied public office knows that the Attorney General cannot hope to make as good an income in office as he could in the active practice of his profession, untramelled by the curtailing influences of his official position as law adviser to the Crown. The Attorney General of today is in a similar position financially. He is debarred from associat-

ing himself professionally with business matters in which the Crown is interested, and in a small community as this is, finds himself compelled to frequently decline valuable business for clients because of their being Government contractors or otherwise interested in matters upon which he has to advise Council.

I am indeed disappointed that these two gentlemen, who were my colleagues in that Executive administration, felt that I was accepting a courtesy from them in accepting the Department of Justice, offered me by my leader, and I assure them that if I had had the faintest thought that the Executive administration regarded the offer of portfolio as a courtesy to me, it would never have been accepted. I accepted it when Sir Edward Morris laid the proposition before me that he could not open a seat, because of the bitter sectarinism of The Evening Telegram newspaper. I have on my desk at the present moment clippings from The Evening Telegram of the autumn of 1913 to prove the truth of this statement. So far as I was concerned, a Roman Catholic leader was good enough for me to follow when I regarded him as a man of ability and brains, broadmindedness and strength of purpose, and from the records of St. John's West I know that there are a large number of the leading Roman Catholic citizens of this town who take the same position towards myself as a Protestant leader, as I took towards Sir Edward, now Lord, Morris, the Roman Catholic leader of that day.

Why think you was it that I offered myself to the constituency of St. John's West? Was it merely because there was a very strong probability of being beaten, or was it because in that constituency there would be the fiercest fight of all the constituencies? I think not. There were seats that were sure seats in this country, as the election has well proven.

But, Sir, there was more in my going to the District of St. John's West than the mere question of an election; there was the question of party, there was the question of prestige. There was above all the fact that if I as a Protestant, a Methodist, a man who was recognized throughout the Island of Newfoundland as having been prominently identified with the Loyal Orange Association in Newfoundland and in the Dominion of Canada, was prepared to go to a constituency the majority of which were Roman Catholics, in which my own Methodist denomination was comparatively small, I was throwing down the gauntlet to the demon of sectarianism, and if elected, destroying it, as, thank God, I believe I shall be instrumental in doing. I was giving the challenge to the man who, like Mr. John R. Bennett, says that a man does not count as a man, but only in the light of the altar at which he worships. If it were not for the fact that I had a belief that there were in this West End constituency electors of strength, of intelligence and honor, men who thought much of public welfare and little of sectarianism; men who would vote for men, principles and party, without having regard to the religious denomination to which the leader belonged, think you, Sir, that I would have dared to offer myself to a constituency in which if every Protestant had voted for me and only Protestants had so voted I could not possibly have been elected. I realize that there was a section of the community from which I was attacked from a sectarian standpoint. Here is some of it. I have seventy-five quotations here listed ready to read to you, but I shall not delay the House at this hour; but the lowest and most contemptible infamy of all I must mention. The Acting

Minister of Shipping has referred to it. It was the fact that from a certain Protestant newspaper office in this city there was circulated the story that a dirty, contemptible, sectarian placard, was being circulated by Mr. Cave as a candidate in the District of Bay de Verde. An infamous lie that was. The false statement started from that newspaper office, the office of The Daily News, and was circulated throughout the entire West End constituency. I can tell you the names of the people who conceived the iniquity, who circulated it, and I know the channels used for the dissemination of the abomination. I spent months in chasing the matter to its source and discovering the individual men who were associated with it. Then, Sir, one of our newspapers, an exclusively Roman Catholic newspaper, attacked me because on last Christmas I did that which I have done every single Christmas for ten years when I have been in Newfoundland at Christmas time, and that was to attend the midnight service in the Cathedral. When a charge was made against me in the papers that I was going around town seeking invitations to Roman Catholic functions, the attack got down to a level when the utterly contemptible baseness of the people who were identified with that attack was such that my traducers were recognised as being fit only to be chased through a sewer by sewer-rats. I would like to be able to believe that there is not a single member of the sitting Opposition who is directly or indirectly connected with any such propaganda, but, Sir, every party has its 'Hang 'er Downs,' bitter, malicious, mean-minded men, who to gain an object, whether that object be vindictiveness or personal or party advantage or benefit would sacrifice the most sacred things in life on the altar of selfishness and revenge. Distasteful as this subject is, I welcome the opportunity of having this question discussed on the floors of this House, and to say to you that I never worked with a man more honourable and true, more loyal as a colleague, cleaner in debate, stronger in purpose, and with greater dignity of character, than my Roman Catholic colleague in the West End and present Minister of Finance, Mr. Brownrigg. There are gentlemen on the other side of the House whom it has been my pleasure to regard as friends for years, and whom I hope it will be my pleasure to continue to so regard for many years to come, in spite of the apparent personal bitterness of their present political hostility towards me.

I shall not detain the House further on this matter other than to reply to a challenge which was made in the "Plaindealer" of January last. This paper, as is well known in St. John's, is an exclusively Roman Catholic publication, and was recognised in conjunction with the "Evening Herald" newspaper as one of the official organs of the self-styled "Hang 'er Down" organization created and led against me by Sir Michael Cashin personally, in the bitter January bye-election contest, in which Mr. Brownrigg and myself signally defeated our opponents. The big display head lines, themselves a lie, read as follows:

"Very Rev. Dr. Whelan, of North "River, insulted and humiliated by "Squires Freebooters."

"Be True to Your Class."

"The West End will 'Hang 'er "Down.'"

From the infamous articles I shall quote but a few sentences:

"On the 22nd you decide whom will "represent you for the next four "years—not represent you in church, "but in the House where the laws "under which you must live and work "are to be made.

"Decide then which men you want "to be there when those laws are

"being framed—two workingmen or "two men who never did a day's work "nor know the sensation of sweating.

"Workingmen or men who never "worked!

"Laborites, or lawyer and mer- "chant!

"Men of your own class, or men "who wouldn't speak to you if they "met you on the street!

"Decide now and "hang 'er down" "till Thursday!"

Again:

"Father Whelan stands too high in "the estimation of the people of the "country to deserve this insolent and "intolerant treatment at the hands of "Squires and his associates.

"It is generally known that after "Squires' victory at the polls in No- "vember, the 'Orange Sentinel,' the "organ of the Orange body of "Toronto, boasted of his overwhelm- "ing defeat of the Roman Catholic "Government, and congratulations "poured in from prominent members "of that body, congratulating him for "having crushed out Catholic Govern- "ment in Newfoundland.

"We presume it is with a desire to "deserve those encomiums that he now "encourages the attack on a promin- "ent Roman Catholic clergyman. We "shall probably be accused by The "Star of raising the sectarian issue, "but we now invite the editor of that "paper, or Premier Squires, to pub- "lish those messages from Toronto, "with his replies thereto, as proof of "our assertion."

I have quoted very briefly from one issue only of one of the Cashin "Hang 'er Down" press. There were a multitude of much more abusive, personally offensive and sectarian attacks than this in the Cashin press, but the Hanzard should not be disgraced by its republication.

Be true to your class! The Bennett West End cry was "Don't vote for Squires; he is not a St. John's man!" Thank God for that, if Mr. Bennett's campaign methods and his low sectarian appeal in this House a few days ago are to be taken as the brand of St. John's birth and breeding. But in that paper at that time associated with the other headings it had another significance which was played to the limit by the loud-mouthed "Hang-'er-ons" of the street corner and the whispers of the back lane. Then note the "Father Whelan" article and the nature of that attack upon me.

As to whether The Orange Sentinel of Toronto made any reference to the Newfoundland elections or not I do not know. I rarely see the paper, but I do know that the English, Canadian and United States press was full of the vilest sectarian lying reports concerning the Newfoundland elections, and after several months' investigation, I can prove that Sir Patrick McGrath, the editor of The Herald, is the man who telegraphed the vile stuff around the world. I have on my desk clippings from "The Times" and other English papers, and from a large selection of Canadian and United States papers, and can prove that the contemptible material on which these articles are based was provided by Sir Patrick McGrath. If such stuff was published in many Canadian papers it would undoubtedly be reprinted in The Orange Sentinel just as it was in The Catholic Record.

But what have I to do with the fact that enemies of the McGrath type succeeded in abusing the confidence of the editors of such papers as The London Times and having maliciously false articles inserted in the columns of papers which are usually regarded as reputable. It is a matter for which I am no more personally responsible than I am for the fact

that the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company has been pleased to have their city manager, Mr. Michael Sullivan, occupy an opposition seat under the leadership of Sir Michael Cashin and in true harmony with Sir Michael's own manner behave himself most offensively towards me in the course of debate.

This Roman Catholic paper, the "Plaindealer," one of the official organs of Sir Michael Cashin's "Hang 'er Down" organization, alleges that certain telegraph messages were received by me from and sent by me to Toronto, and suggests that these messages were of a sectarian character such as to justify the "Plaindealer" in denouncing me as unworthy of political support by my Roman Catholic fellow-citizens. I received one tele graph message and one only from Toronto, and sent one telegraph message and one only to Toronto. As to how Mr. O'Neil of the "Plaindealer" learned that I had received and sent telegraph messages via the Anglo and to Toronto, I do not know. In that connection one has to consider the possibility of a "Hang 'er Down" spy system either at my law office or at the offices of the Anglo American Telegraph Company, or both.

In response to the challenge of the "Plaindealer" to publish these messages I now read them to the House. The one and only message I received from Toronto was from a personal friend of long standing and contained six words only; these were words of sincere and hearty congratulations from my friend on my personal success and had absolutely not the faintest tinge of sectarianism or any other 'ism save only the warmth of personal friendliness. The one and only message I sent Toronto was addressed to a personal friend and has reference to a message from his at Ottawa, which message was a two-word cablegram: "Hearty Congratulations." It was addressed to Mr. H. C. Hocken, member of the Dominion Parliament:

"Thanks for your message. My vic-
"tory was in spite of Orange Leaders
"opposition and not because of their
"help. Every Past Grand Master was
"an active opponent, Captain Kean
"being one of Cashin's candidates.
"Past Deputy Grand Piccott and
"Forbes also Cashin Candidates. Pud-
"dester was offensively abusive; also
"John Currie. Cave and Penney sup-
"ported me to a finish. Both were
"made the butt of vilest personal abuse
"by Puddester. Cave, one of my can-
"didates, has been elected. If any re-
"ference is made in Sentinel to my
"success, I want it to be made quite
"clear that Puddester, Kean, Forbes,
"Currie, Piccott, Martin, and all
"other leading Orangemen of Grand
'Lodge except Cave and Penney were
'active enemies."

"My general reference to the Orange association was due to the fact that Mr. Hocken is one of the leading Orangemen of Canada. He and his wife were entertained at my home in 1913 when the session of the Grand Lodge of British America was held here, and they with my wife and myself were guests during that visit at the well-known annual function under the auspices of the Christian Brothers —the Mount Cashel Garden Party.

My reference to the Orange Sentinel was due to the fact that Mr. Hocken is the proprietor and editor of that paper, and I wanted to be quite sure that he would not be misled by the sectarian nonsense that was being telegraphed abroad by whom I then did not know but whom I now know to have been Sir Patrick McGrath, the editor of the Herald.

As this House and the country well know, I am not in the habit of replying to charges made against me, but as Sir Michael Cashin introduced this matter and Mr. Bennett and Mr. Fox spoke on sectarianism at some length

and the Plaindealer challenged me to publish these messages, I give the House the benefit of a knowledge of the facts.

Let me now for a brief moment make reference to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor and the public policy therein outlined. The gentlemen of the Opposition have been pleased to refer to it as an empty document, a poorly-drafted production a baloon, and Sir Michael Cashin, the Leader of the Opposition, held the document aloft and in his usual classic language denounced it "a Cod".

The first paragraph is, I sumbit, a suitable reference to the signing of the Treaty of Peace with Germany.

The second refers to the courtesy of the British Admiralty in donating to Newfoundland two steamers. Certain members of the Opposition were pleased to say that the British Admiralty ships were fit for nothing but to be used as breakwaters. For my own part, I have no such opinion of the ships of the British Navy, and I am pleased to note that His Excellency the Governor in his formal address extended to the British Admiralty an expression of appreciation from the Government of Newfoundland for the courtesy with which they had entertained our request for ships. I regret very much that that courtesy should be the subject of such hostile criticism by my friends opposite.

In view of the magnificent address in which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries dealt with the matter of the fish regulations and the policy of the Government in connection with fish matters, and in view further of the fact that the Leader of the Opposition rose in his place in the House at the conclusion of the address of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and congratulated the Government through the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on its fish policy and past program, I feel that it is not necessary for me at this moment to deal further with this very important part of the policy of the present Government, and the successful manner in which the regulations have operated for the benefit of the trade generally, in spite of the fact that members of the Opposition on public platforms and in private conversation and the Opposition press have for months been so abusive to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Government because they had the courage to put their convictions on matters of fish policy into practical operation.

The winding-up of the Department of Militia has been referred to. Is it not the fact, as one of the Opposition members has stated, that there is nothing to do in that Department. The Chief Staff Officer, Lieut. Col. Rendell, than whom it would be difficult to find a more competent and courteous gentleman to handle the affairs of the Department, informs me that it will be many months before the business of the Department can be finally wound up, month by month the staff is being lessened and every pressure that can be put upon the Department to expedite the finalization of its work is being brought to bear.

The reference to the work of Rev. Father Nangle is one which I am sure must be appreciated by every member of the Opposition. The whole people of Newfoundland, particularly those who, like myself, had closest friends and relatives in the battle-line, recognises the grandeur of his work. I desire to avail of this moment in which to heartily congratulate the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who during his recent tour of the battle-fields of France and Flanders conceived the idea of enlarging the purchase which the Government had determined upon in the matter of a site for the War Memorial at Beaumont Hamel to include the entire Beaumont Hamel battle-field. He tele-

graphed his recommendations in that regard to me, and I can assure this House and the country that the Executive Administration appreciated very much th e wise and thoughtful recommendation of the Minister and concluded arrangements whereby this historic spot, consecrated as it is, with the heroic sacrifice of many of Newfoundland's noblest and best, should form a part of Newfoundland in France, and have consecrated within its hallowed enclosures the material bodies of those who went forth from us to offer their lives upon the altar of freedom. Major Nangle has done excellent work. It would be impossible for me to convey to you an expression of too high appreciation of his splendid services. It would be difficult indeed for any country to be better represented in this specific work than Newfoundland is represented by Padre Nangle.

I was particularly amused when the Leader of the Opposition, Sir Michael Cashin, was addressing the House on the matter of Estimates. It will be remembered that the Speech from the Throne indicates the intention of the Government to lay upon the Table of the House bona fide Estimates with a view to the discontinuance of the unconstitutional practice which has grown up during recent years of deliberately undervoting supplies and depending to an abnormally large extent upon the granting by a subsequent session of the Legislature of Supplemental Supplies to cover the necessary expenes of the Civic Service. It will be noted that the paragraph contains the statement that Supplemental Supply will be avoided "as far as practicable," and the honourable gentlemen opposite gazed upon these words "as far as practicable" and ridiculed them, little realizing that by so doing they were showing their own lack of appreciation of the facts and their own lack of a knowledge of practical administration of public affairs. Let me illustrate. The late Administration undertook the construction of a new wing to the Sanitarium. It is probable that that work will be completed and ready for occupancy by October or November of this year. The estimated cost of fuel, light, maintenance and staff required in connection with that important addition is not included within the scope of the Estimates which will be tabled within the course of the next few weeks. The Estimates in that regard will be made as perfect as it is practicable to make them at the present moment. Likewise in the case of the Lunatic Asylum. Within the course of the present year the new Lunatic Asylum wing will be ready for occupancy. The probable cost of operation, upkeep and maintenance of that new wing is alsonot fully included, but the Estimates are correct insofar as it is practicable to make them at the present moment. Take the Coastal Service. The man who would venture at this moment to make a definite statement as to the cost of the Coastal Service for the year 1920-21 would indeed be a prophet. The Estimates in that regard also are correct as far as practicable. It might be possible to conceive of one of the junior members of the House spinning an oration to these words, but for the Leader of the Opposition, who boasts of his seniority in the House, he having occupied a seat for twenty-eight years, Minister of Finance for many years and Prime Minister for a brief period, to attempt criticism based upon the fact that it is impracticable under the circumstances to bring in Estimates which would be in themselves perfect and really accurate forecasts rather than mere estimates is so laughable as to approach the point of being ridiculous.

The reorganization in the Department of Marine and Fisheries is a

matter which will be more fully indicated when the Estimates are laid before you. I am quite sure this much needed readjustment will meet with the hearty approval and unanimous endorsation of the entire House. It would be difficult to find a more vigorous or more enthusiastic worker, a more capable and earnest Executive head, than the Department of Marine & Fisheries has in the person of the President of the Fishermen's Protective Union. We have to remember one thing in this connection and in connection witb the fish regulations and the various bills that will be introduced under his auspices during this session, and that is, that the man who occupies the position of President of a large fishermen's organization has one object and one object only, and that is to serve the people with whom his life work is identified. I am satisfied from my experience at the Executive Board with Mr. Coaker that with him self does not come first, that the fishermen of the country, their homes, their happiness, their welfare and prosperity, come first in all his ambitions.

The organization of the Department of Posts and Telegraphs, under the Acting Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, Mr. Halfyard, is a matter witn which I am sure the entire House will also be in full accord. It is not a case of Dr. Robinson's being dismissed, as has been suggested by his admirer, Mr. Fox. A few days after I became Colonial Secretary I asked Mr. Mews to get in touch with Dr. Robinson and ask him to call to see me. Dr. Robinson did not call, but wrote a letter to Mr. Mews saying that he declined to accord me the interview sought. The first thing I did was to throw the letter into the waste-paper basket at my left, but on second thought I picked it out so that it might have a place on my curiosity file. From that day to this I have not had an interview with Dr. Robinson. I did not send for him again, nor did I ask anybody else to do so. Some little time later he tendered his resignation, and in view of his previous discourtesy and his apparent objections to working in harmony with my Administration, his resignation was immediately accepted. I can quite understand how antagonistic he was feeling to the Government. The mere fact that it is his name which constitutes Robinson & Company, Ltd., the proprietors and publishers of the "Daily News" newspaper is in itself sufficient evidence that to the Government to which his company and paper were so bitterly antagonistic he would be an obstructionist rather than a helper.

The matter of the creation of a Department of Education is one that has caused considerable newspaper comment. My friend, the member for St. George's, has referred to it on several occasions. I feel sure that during the course of debate the Government will have the advantage of some helpful suggestions from Mr. MacDonnell, who has had a considerable experience as a Superintendent of Education for the Roman Catholic denomination in the District of St. George's. Mr. MacDonnell is, I believe, a Bachelor in Arts, and has practical knowledge in connection with educational matters in Newfoundland. I welcome most heartily the assistance which I know he will gladly give in the debates upon this vitally important subject of education with which we have to deal most carefully, so that our Colony may have the very best educational organization that we can give it. My idea, Sir, is that the Minister of Education and his Department will be the keystone in the educational arch of our present denomination system, so that the whole organization may be so co-related as to bear in the best way possible our educational burdens. The idea of the abolition of the present system of edu-

cation in this country is not for one moment contemplated; to interfere with it is not for one moment contemplated. To operate it more efficiently, to provide it with additional grants, to give it better organization, to help the various religious bodies to a fuller extent to provide educational facilities for their children; these are the objects of the creation of a Ministry of Education. In this House there are several experienced educationists. Dr. Barnes is a specially trained and experienced man. Mr. MacDonnell has had considerable training and experience. Mr. Halfyard, Mr. Samson, Mr. Scammell, Mr. LeGrow, and perhaps others, have had practical training and experience. I consequently feel sure that when the Education Bill comes forward for discussion it will receive such thorough consideration and careful, critical scrutiny that there will emerge from the debate a measure which will receive the unanimous support of the House and be the most valued addition to this session's legislation. The country has to remember one thing, and that is that we have very few, if any, entirely Government schools in this country. As Secretary of the Board of Governors of the Methodist College, think you, that I consider the Methodist College as a Government school? Not at all. If it were not for the help of the Methodist people in Newfoundland, the Ladies' Aid organization and other enthusiastic educational helpers, that institution could not exist. Take the Christion Brothers' Schools, Bishop Field College, St. Bonaventure's College, Bishop Spencer College, the Commercial Departments in connection with the Convent schools from which we get practically all our stenographers, does any one believe that these receive Government grants sufficient to maintain them? Throughout the length and breadth of our Island Home the schools that are dotted around our towns are maintained not exclusively by Government grants, but partly by Government grants and partly by the enterprise of the religious organizations by which the schools are operated. If it were not for the live interest of the various religious organizations, if it were not for the enthusiasm of the people of the different denominations who put self-sacrificing effort behind the educational problems of their respective denominations education would be backward indeed; there would be few schools and fewer Boards of Education. We have to do our best to get the most efficient educational organizations that we can so that our various religious denominations may be helped to better and most efficient effort, so that every boy and girl may have a chance to learn at least to read and write and start with some degree of a fair chance of taking his or her place in the struggle of this twentieth century.

Now to refer to the Department of Agriculture and Mines. I think we all know of the activities of Dr. Campbell, the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, in the political campaign in the District of St. John's West. Dr. Campbell was defeated after a magnificent fight. The same ability as an organizer, and the same tireless energy and enthusiastic effort he is now devoting to the much-needed reorganization of his important department. Reorganization has already been begun in the most important practical branch, that of agriculture. The Department is now a centre of practical help and encouragement for farmers and will become of immense importance to Newfoundland agriculturally. It will also be reorganized in the matter of mines, water-powers, forest wealth and the various other branches which come within the scope of the extensive operations of the Department. The old Sir Robert Bond idea of a Model Farm has been

revivified; not an experimental station, but a practical business proposition, the object of which is to help the development of farming enterprise. I am satisfied that under the able guidance of Dr. Campbell this Department will become a public utility which will play an important part in the Colony's future.

The paragraph referring in general terms to coastal and inland transportation has been the subject of much Opposition merriment. The Member for Placentia and St. Mary's asked that correspondence with the Reid-Newfoundland Company be tabled, and that was done. A Committee of Council was appointed some time ago to look into the whole situation and report. Several of the members of the Opposition have asked, almost pleaded with, the Government that the Reid Newfoundland Company be given fair play. They will be given fair play. In the consideration of the railway problem the fact that the Reid Newfoundland Company was the personal, bitter, malicious, aggressive political opponent of this administration will not be permitted to influence decisions. The problem will be dealt with fairly, frankly and fully. It will be considered simply as a business proposition in which the interests of the Colony must be fully safeguarded. This matter has for some weeks past been daily receiving and will for some time to come be receiving earnest thought and consideration.

The situation in connection with coastal contracts is also a matter of major importance. Newfoundland is primarily a coastal country. The extreme difficulty of securing steamers, the enormous cost, the fact that contractors feel that if they invest large sums of money in steamers the values will have so depreciated in five or eight years that they will be faced with large losses on capital account, are problems which are receiving most careful consideration.

Opposite me is sitting the late Minister of Shipping, who has full knowledge of the great difficulties to be faced in dealing with these problems and all matters appertaining to the coastal trade. I feel quite certain that the experience which he has gained during the years when he was Minister of Shipping will be gladly placed at the service of the Colony in the course of the debate on matters appertaining to that Department.

Much criticism has also been offered concerning the pronouncement as to Workingmen's Homes. From listening to some of the honorable members opposite, particularly Mr. Bennett, one would conclude that this past week was their first week in Parliament. These gentlemen have at last aroused themselves to the fact that some steps should be taken immediately to improve the housing condition of the working classes. I would remind the House that the first pronouncement made by any Government in favour of assisting in this connection is this paragraph in His Excellency's Speech. These present critics say the pronouncement is not full enough. May I ask what they did during the past six years to help improve housing conditions among the poor? From their words in this House one would conclude that the Hansard of last session and of many sessions past would be filled with their activities in this regard.

The facts are that the Government encouraged the incorporation of a Company to undertake the construction of workingmen's homes and their subsequent rental or sale.

This Company received the support of very many citizens who realized the situation and were prepared to invest money to help solve the housing problem. These investors do not

expect to get as good a dividend on their investment as they would if the investment were made in Government Bonds; but to make dividends for themselves is not their consideration; their desire is to help improve local housing conditions.

The workers who have made themselves primarily responsible for this undertaking are Mr. James McGrath, for many years President of the Longshoremen's Union, Hon. John Anderson, and Hon. M. P. Gibbs. I am informed that the Company's bankers are the Royal Bank of Canada and that the Eastern Trust Company has been asked to undertake the business management of the Company's operations.

The Company has already on order large quantities of lumber and other building materials. The Government has agreed to permit importation free of duty of such building material and fittings as it is necessary to import for the building and equipment of the houses. The Company has, I am informed, prepared a programme for submission to the Government, and I have assured the Company and now assure the House that any reasonable business proposition submitted by the Company will receive careful and courteous consideration.

The suggestion that thirty houses would be erected during the next few months has been ridiculed. The opinion of the company expressed to me is that the most they can expect to accomplish during the summer months, having due regard to local lumber supplies, local labor available and the necessary principle of building construction economy so essential in the erection of houses to be sold or rented at a minimum cost, is thirty houses.

This is the first and a very important step in connection with an important social service programme, for it must be remembered that housing conditions have an important bearing upon public health and public morality.

The burden of the criticism of my honorable friends opposite, except insofar as some of them were personally abusive, was that the Speech did not fully cover the entire programme outlined in my Manifesto published in October last. My honorable friends failed to realise the fact so well known to the more experienced members, namely, that the Speech from the Throne is a formal document dealing officially and briefly with points of major importance from an official standpoint and is not expected by those who have even an elementary kuowledge of parliamentary practice to be a voluminous reprint of a general party programme which will require years to fully accomplish. If my honorable friends would refer to the various Speeches from the Throne of the past ten years they will see at a glance that no Government during these years has attempted to outline in the official opening Address such a complete and important programme as outlined on this occasion.

Several members of the Opposition have referred to the High Cost of Living. In spite of the statement of various members of the Opposition and the Opposition press to the contrary, the Government of Newfoundland cannot control the price of coal at Newcastle, New York or Sydney; the price of beef and pork in Chicago; the price of wheat in Western Canada and the Western States. But the Government can and will see that unjust profits shall not be charged to the consumer. The Government proposes to lay before the House at this session a bill drafted along the lines of the English Act to protect the consumer from unjust charges. The time has come when we must get down to the proposition of doing the very best

possible for our Colony, having regard to our large financial obligations. We have to remember that the very best that Newfoundland can do for our soldiers and sailors and their dependents must be done; on the other hand we can go only as far as the resources of the Colony will permit. Obligations are heavy. The revenue is very satisfactory, but because it is good today, there is no guarantee that on the morrow when prices drop, our revenue will not be seriously depleted because of the fact that the revenue is made up to such a large extent of advalorem duties.

Thus, Sir, the Estimates have been drafted having regard to economy on the one hand, and efficiency on the other, and it is hoped that during the course of office of this administration it will be possible to do very substantial work for the reorganization of the public service.

I will refer to one other matter, Sir, and that is a reference made by my honorable friend, Mr. John R. Bennett. "This House," he said, "is divided by a line which may lead to serious consequences." This House is divided by parties; these parties sit on opposite side of the House; in that sense the House is divided by a table and an open space. Beyond that recognized division of parties and the physical separation of parties in this Chamber I know of no such line as that referred to by the honorable member for St. John's West, Mr. Bennett. If the honorable member desires to create such a division as is suggested by certain of his remarks, then I regret his attitude. But he will not succeed if he makes any such attempt. This House knows no such dividing line. I know no such division; this Government knows no such division. As Newfoundlanders we have one duty and one duty only, and that is to serve this country we call home. I can assure the Opposition that that is the one ambition of this administration, and I feel sure that as the days pass and the members of the Opposition, who during the past few days have been displaying personal bitterness and pique, get the virus of disappointment and the bitterness of defeat worked out of their system by personal abuse of myself and my associates, these gentlemen will settle down as Newfoundlanders themselves with the Government and join in our desire to do the best we know how for the interests of our common Colony.

We stand, Sir, not divided, as Mr. Bennett declares, by a "line which may lead to serious consequences," but, in so far as we are true men and Newfoundlanders, we stand united in the strong determination of helping Newfoundland in the difficult days of reorganization, reconstruction and readjustment in which the Colony finds itself.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—In moving the adjournment of the House, I would like to refer to a matter that I know a lot of people are interested in. The Hon. Prime Minister and the Hon. Acting Minister of Shipping have expressed themselves fairly well, I am sure, and I am heart and soul in accord with some things they said. Now, sir, I very seldom read the papers of this country, but some friends of mine called my attention to what appeared in the Daily Star, under date of April 28th, in which my character was assailed in low-down, base and scurrilous fashion. I understand the Prime Minister has something to do with the control of this paper. Well if he is sincere in his utterances and is desirous of having a cleaner press and a cleaner public life, as he wishes us to believe to-night, I say right here now that this sort of vile stuff must cease and cease immediately. My answer to the paper that publish-

es this kind of trash is that it is not fit for any decent person in the city to read, and the one that wrote it is a "scavenger" of the worst type. The article in question says in part: "Sir John said Annie told him the story etc." It's about time that this thing was stopped and I am quite in sympathy with what the acting minister of shipping said. Now one of those days I am going to horsewhip some of the secret service men around here who write such ghoulish reports for the Star, and when I do make a move in that direction, the one who gets the horsewhipping will have cause to remember me afterwards. Let me emphasize that these secret service men come around here solely for the purpose of defaming and besmirching the reputations of decent and respectable citizens in this House. I tell you again, Mr. Speaker, that if we intend to live up to anything decent in this House, that this has got to stop. I notice the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries laughing. He is in a jocular mood to-night. He knows the crowd that is carrying it on. He got rid of them, consequently his paper is better. I repeat, Mr. Speaker that such foul stuff is written for my daughter's and other men's daughters to read, and it does not tend to give me respect either from my wife or my children. What these yellow references, contained in The Star, mean, I do not know, nor do I want to know, but this much is certain that it reflects upon my character and decency the way my name was dragged in, and I am not going to allow any man in this House or outside of it to carry on that sort of game with impunity. If there is any man who has anything against me, why not come and tackle me in a manly way, I can stand it, but I am not going to allow such trash to be published in this country about me. I appeal to the Prime Minister to-night to have this brand of stuff cut out of the paper. Just try it for a week and see how the paper would look. Any foreigner reading such filthy matter would naturally say: "Give us something clean to read." I also call upon the Hon. Dr. Barnes, Minister of Education, to see that this class of stuff is cut out of the public journals of the country. As Dr. Barnes well knows, it is not the uneducated man that usually causes trouble, but the educated man by the paragraph that he writes. If the Prime Minister is serious over the idea of endeavouring to have a cleaner press, I can assure him that I will be only too willing and too glad to give him my support and influence. After all, I am a Newfoundlander and am, therefore, entitled to be treated as such; and I do want to impress upon this country that I do not want to give Dr. Barnes money for educational purposes while abuse and slander permeates our city press.

Another matter that I would like to refer to, seeing that it has food for reflection for these secret service men again. An article was written during the election campaign that touched a tender spot for the first time with. I would like to have hold of the cur who wrote it and I would put him in his proper place. That article was written under a nom-de plume and referred to the late Mr. Crosbie. That was the father who produced me and that was my tender spot. As I have said before, attack me all you like and as often as you like in a fair manner and I am prepared to defend myself, but when it comes to raking the name of a deceased father, whose memory I still love and cherish, I think that that is hitting below the belt. On turning up the back files of the Daily Star for September 25th, I noticed a letter was

written attacking my dead father. It was signed Brigus, but it was written in the Star office. When I entered Brigus on October 2nd I saw the letter. The people of Brigus could never write such a letter about a Crosbie.

Now I would say to the Prime Minister, you have laid down the principle to-night and I hope you will live up to it. I want to tell that I was born and christened in the Methodist Church. I have lots of Roman Catholic friends and Orange friends, and when I am gone, well, there'll be one more Protestant gone.

I again appeal to the manhood of the Prime Minister and the Acting Minister of Shipping to try and have a cleaner press, and if they see anything indecent going on to have a stop put to it. I hope and trust that this debate will be fruitful of good results and not go away in the air.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, in seconding Sir John's motion that we do now adjourn until Monday afternoon at three of the clock, I would say that if the Whole House is consistently sincere I concur in the motion entirely because there is a considerable amount of stuff printed in the newspapers that should not be there. I have samples of some of it on my desk now, which I have extracted from The Herald, and which only serve to degrade our public life.

And it being past midnight, Saturday, May 1st, 1920.

On motion the report of the committee on the Address in Reply was adopted.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

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

Hon. Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Judicature Act."

Hon. Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled "An Act to Incorporate the Women's Patriotic Association of Newfoundland."

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter four of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled "Of Legislative Disabilities and the Vacation of Seats in the House of Assembly."

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, MAY 3rd. 1920

MR. WINSOR:—Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of taking part in this debate. but seeing that so many both Opposition and Government members are doing so, I think it is up to me to make a few remarks.

I wish to join with the previous speakers in congratulating you upon your appointment as First Commoner of the land, and I feel as they do that the honour has not only been paid you. but to all the fishermen of the Colony. Coming from the ranks of the fishermen myself, I feel a little more at home, when a fisherman is at the head of affairs.

A few days ago the leader of the Opposition said with regard to the intention of the Government to make farmers out of returned soldiers, that the most of them have been fishermen, and that he thinks you cannot make farmers out of fishermen. Now I am of the opinion that if it is possible to make the First Commoner of the Land out of a fisherman, it is an easy matter to make farmers out of fishermen.

I also wish to congratulate the Mover and Seconder of the Address in Reply. Not only do I feel it is my duty to congratulate these gentlemen, but I also wish to thank them, and to

acknowledge that I owe them a debt, for the service they rendered Empire and Country, and the protection they afforded us here. Like all true Britishers these gentlemen were not satisfied with the Victory they won on the battlefield, they were not satisfied to finish up with the fight they won, they returned home and took upon themselves the responsibility of fighting the political Huns of the country. They are true Britishers, and having been into the fight they want to continue.

I want to thank the Hon. member for Ferryland, Mr. Moore, for the bouquet that he threw across the House to my colleague, Mr. Abbott and myself, referring to the appointment of a Minister of Agriculture and Mines, it was something on these lines. He was surprised that Mr. Coaker was satisfied that a man not having a seat in this House, should get this office when two such capable men as Mr. Winsor and Mr. Abbott were available to fill the position. Now I wish to say for my part, had Mr. Coaker asked me to take charge of that department, I would have declined, and had he insisted, I would resign my seat in this House. I would decline because of my lack of Agricultural knowledge. I think the Government ought to feel proud, and the Premier has reason to be proud, that he can get such a man as Dr. Campbell to fill this position. He has a hard proposition ahead of him. He will not only have to use his Agricultural ability, but he will have to use his Medical ability as well in this position, and he is entitled to the full support of the Government he forms a part of.

When I first entered this House I received lots of information on many points. One was that you had to address the Speaker, and be sure to keep to the subject. If not, you would be called down. Now a word about Sectarianism. Before I entered this work I knew no man by the faith he believed in, and many times I have regreted that I ever took up this work, but if I thought the time would ever come when I would have to judge a man by his faith, then I would curse the day I ever touched it. Remarks have been made that this is the place to deal with it. That is right. We have to admit that this thing exists, we are face to face with it. If this is so, Mr. Speaker, if this is the right place to deal with it, then let us deal with it correctly, and have done with it. To-day we are writing history, and this history the people will read. When it is read fifty or a hundred years from now, don't let it be said that instead of doing our best for the people who sent us here, that we spent our time discussing sectarianism. To my mind what has brought about this condition of things is nothing mone or less than the dirty unscrupulous politicians we have had in this country, who would stop at nothing to gain a seat in this Assembly. My six years experience in public life has had been that political affairs in this country are nothing more than a seething mass of corruption. When there are men in this country who will sit around the Executive Council and make an appeal for one hundred, two or three thousand dollars, such a man would not regard your religion, his own or mine, then we should not trust our religion in the hands of these men. If the Hon. member for St. John's East, who gave us that splendid address the other night, and who expressed himself so broad-mindedly on this subject, went down those winding stairs thinking to himself, I gave those Protestant fellows over there a good fleecing, and we of the other denominations think that we gave the Catholic members a fleecing, then I say it would be better if those words had been left unsaid. In my opinion there is only one way

to stamp this thing out from amongst us. That is, let Mr. Fox, the Hon. Member for St. John's East, who represents the Catholic faith and appears to be very sincere on this point, and I believe he is sincere, take with him some more young men of his denomination, and let some of the young men of the Protestant denomination join with them, and be determined to protect and denounce this sectarianism in every way.

Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the great changes that have taken place the world over, and especially in Newfoundland, some of them, Sir, in this Assembly. For this last few years there have been quite a lot of debates on fishery matters, which is justly right, seeing our main industry is our fisheries. If you were to take the debates of this Assembly of bygone years, you would find that debates on fishery matters are as scarce as fish is in the Dead Sea. Why was this? Because of the class of men who sat here as representatives of the people. They were generally doctors, lawyers, business men and such like, who knew very little about the most important work of our country; and if by chance a real representative of the fishermen did get here, he was soon made to understand by his political advisers that he was here to get what he could for himself, and let the people look out for themselves.

Regarding the Fishery Regulations that there has been so much about, and have occupied some time in debates, I can only view it from a standpoint of a fisherman or a layman, and not as an exporter. Whether these Regulations are perfect or not, I am not prepared to say, but yet I feel sure we are in need of something to put our fisheries on a proper basis, for we are living in the twentieth century with a fishing system the same as a century ago, in fact, not as good, because the curing of our fish has been demoralized; still we expect to compete with other countries in the fishery business, who have taken the advantage of all the modern improvements of to-day.

When these Regulations were first put into force it was thought by some that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, also being a large exporter, was joining with other large exporters of this town to crush the small outport exporter. This thing is now contradicted, for we have heard from some of these men who spoke on this subject, and have shown how it has already helped them. I watched the debates in the Board of Trade on this subject during the winter, and I came to the conclusion that the opposition to these Regulations had more than one cause behind it—some from a political point of view, some because of the source from which it came, and some from those with no organizing abilities, and believed they should be in the same lines as their grandfathers were. Anyhow, the information given by the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries a few nights ago, has cleared the minds of many, and as shown, if these Regulations are properly supported, will prove a great blessing to our fisheries. As regards the standardization of our fish, this is another matter of great importance, and I hope to have something to say on this when a Bill is brought before us for this purpose. Perhaps the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries will have a Bill so well prepared that we will not need to do any hashing with it, but just support it. Many claim that the only thing required to give us good fish is for the buyers to pay the man a better price for good fish than they do for an inferior quality. No doubt, this will have a good effect. You have to realize, Mr. Speaker, that our fish-making system is demoralized, and our fishermen will want both encouragement and assurance that they will be paid for the extra trouble with it. For without a doubt, there will be political

hypocrites trying to show to the fishermen that they are only paid for their Number One fish, the same as if it was sold talqual, really loosing on all, not Number One. This, of course, will cause some trouble among the fishermen; still it may be remedied by the influence of the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

When the Hon. Leader of the Opposition was speaking on the move that the Government had made regarding providing workingmen's homes, he said many of the members on the Government side will not be interested in this, seeing that they belong to the outports. As for my part, Mr. Speaker, I realize I am elected here by the people of Bonavista district, and to the people of that district I owe a duty, and will try my best to perform it, yet in the meantime I realize I have to consider other people as well, no matter whether they live in this town or anywhere else. I believe that every man that is willing to work, should have a comfortable home. I don't know if you call it socialism, democracy or what, but I do claim that every man that is prepared to do an honest day's work, no matter what his occupation may be, whether it be fisherman, farmer, carpenter, laborer of every class, the State owes to that man a comfortable home, be able to feed and clothe his children, means to give them a good education, and to be able to lay a dollar oneside for old age, and pay his funeral expenses, so that when leaving this world and going into the one above, he will give St. Peter to understand he is coming there independent.

Mr. Speaker, it is amusing to some of us to listen to those members on the Opposition, who sat so long in the Government, doing very little for the welfare of the people; but now they are on the Opposition they are very earnest. The Hon. Leader, Sir Michael Cashin, laboured for nearly an hour, pulling up his sleeves and wiping the sweat from his brow, trying to impress the present Government on the great need of homes for the working men of this town, yet that Hon. gentleman sat for years in the Government and paid no attention to their appeal. And now the Government has attempted to do something, he is trying his best to ridicule it; and when refering to this clause, the Hon. gentleman held up the Speech from the Throne to this Honse, and said there is nothing in it, it is only a cod. Maybe, Mr. Speaker, that word is not parliamentary for me to use. I would not have used it if it had not been used by my superior parliamentarian. Whether this Speech is a cod or not, Sir, I am prepared to stand by this Government and the Leader of this Government if it will only try to perform what is included in this Speech. And I may say, not only do I expect it to be done in one year, but if it is done in four years I will be justified in saying there will have been more done for the general welfare of this country, than for the twenty-eight years the Hon. Leader of the Opposition has had the pleasure of holding a seat in this Assembly.

MR. JENNINGS:—Mr. Speaker, in order not to occupy more time than possible in offering my congratulations to you and to our two brave soldier lads and to some of the speakers on the Opposition side, I will follow the example to some extent of a very lazy man of whom I read some years ago. This man although extremely lazy was in the habit of saying his prayers when retiring at night. After a while he thought of a plan whereby he could avoid this trouble, so he wrote the prayers and underneath he penned the words, "These are my sentiments." He fixed this over his head and on retiring nodded his head toward the prayers and retired. So I would like to gather up all the best things that have been said in the way of congratulations and offer them to you as

my sentiments and pass on to more serious problems.

I did not intend to take part in the debate at this juncture but I want to make a few remarks in reply to a charge made by the Hon. leader of the Opposition and also a statement by the Member for St. John's West, Mr. Bennett. I was surprised at the acrimonous tone he introduced into his speech the other day. When that gentleman occupied a seat on this side of the House his remarks were usually courteous and never offensive and I am afraid at this time in the heat of debate he said things which perhaps he would rather on cooler judgment wish unsaid. I refer particularly to his broad, unqualified statement, "That the election was fought and won on sectarian issues all over the country." I want to tell that gentleman that we would not touch the dirty, filthy thing with a forty-foot pole, in the District of Twillingate. We could have sat down and won our election without making a speech, without visiting a settlement, and would have been returned with a substantial majority, and I say right here that if in the future elections have to be won on sectarian lines I shall never again occupy a seat in this House.

In the district of Twillingate most of the people belong to the Protestant Denomination, but there are a few settlements where there are a number of people who are of the Roman Catholic persuasion. We visited these settlements and were treated decently. I don't know how they voted; we received votes enough to return us twice over and we shall give every class and every section of the District the same treatment and the same fair play from Cobb's Arm to Shoe Cove irrespective of the altar at which they worship. Down in the Public Works Department a number of the officials belong to the R. C. Denomination, but to me they are all men; they have treated me with every courtesy and I have tried to accord to them the same treatment, which I trust will continue during my term of office.

I have been able to put a little patronage, since coming into office, in the way of four of our returned soldiers, but I did not make any enquiries into either their politics or religion, but was glad to be able to do a little on their behalf. Not so much can be said regarding the appointment of a young lady to a vacancy in the Public Works Dept. last October. This was a position which could have been easily filled by one of our crippled soldiers with just a little education, a position for which I have four applications on file at the present time, but there was no consideration given to these men at that time. The appointment was made for purely political purposes.

The Hon. leader of the Opposition, in his speech the other day, made the charge that one of the Public Depts was being prostituted. When he made that statement it caused me tc think. Circumstances have placed me at the head of a Department which has certainly been prostituted with a vengeance.

In the year 1913, previous to the election, a large surplus special was allocated to the different districts, in many instances given to private individuals to work it out or not as they saw fit. This was at that time not illegal according to law.

At the following session in the winter of 1914 the Opposition and particularly the F. P. U. men strongly criticized such a system of handling public moneys.

Sir Edward Morris, the leader of the Government at that time, formed a Select Committee to draft a Bill, and I had the privilege to serve on that committee, which was representative of both sides of the House. The

Local Affairs Act was the result and we considered a great moral victory was gained when a law was passed providing that all public grants for roads, bridges and whatever were to be spent only under the supervision of legally appointed Boards. Now what do we find in the year 1919. In spite of that law we find the head of the Public Works Dept., whose special duty it was to see that law observed, breaking that law right and left and encouraging other members of the Government of which he was a member to do the same. When the announcement was made by the Minister of Finance last Spring that a large surplus special would be available for Public Works we were all pleased, as the needs of the different districts in this respect were great. In conjunction with my colleagues we prepared a list of special needs and presented them to the Government. All these requests were ignored and the distribution of this money in the District of Twillingate was given to a prospective candidate who came out on the Cashin ticket.

The Local Affairs Act was ignored and grants given to private individuals with no safeguard whatever as to what might be done with the money.

Of the three hundred and thirty thousand dollars allocated under the supervision of the Public Works Dept. the per capita share for Twillingate District from this amount was $23,624.15 but there was actually allocated the sum of $12,728.40 or just about half of its appropriation. What became of the other half? The explanation is not hard to find. Harbour main's per capita share was $14,107.-75. There was allocated to Harbour main $27,580.14 or almost double its share; there's where Twillingate's money went. Fogo had much the same treatment. Its per capita share was $14,098.13, it actually received $7,304.40. Where did the half of Fogo's grant bring up? That too is not hard to find out. Port de Grave's per capita appropriation was $10,623.-35, it received $16,182.92; that's where the other half of Fogo's grant went. A few weeks ago I got from the Marine & Fisheries Dept. a statement of the appropriation for Twillingate of the Marine & Fisheries grant; its share from that source was $20,387.94. The first item of expenditure was $1,000.00 transferred to Trinity District. Farther down the list were other transfers to different districts amounting in all to nearly $10,000.00 or about half of that grant. One of these transfers was made on November 14th to the Public Works Dept. On making inquiries I found that this $1500.00 had been sent to Ferryland. Now in view of these facts the Members for Ferryland can hardly expect me to send much special money to that District during my term of office.

Prostitution indeed with a vengeance, and in view of the needs of Twillingate District such conduct is nothing short of piratical, but is in accordance with the doctrine preached and practised by the late Government in order to buy the electorate.

Shortly after coming into office, hearing the rumours of abnormal stocks of vegetables supplied to the different public institutions, I took occasion to visit each one to see for myself. I did not go particularly to enquire into the "green pea" scandal, but more in relation to the stocks of potatoes and turnips. I did find rather heavy stocks, but this part was not so serious as the quality supplied, much of which was absolutely trash, no assortment, but small and rotten all dumped in together. I questioned the employees whether they ever had any instructions to reject any of those vegetables as unfit as they were being supplied by the different parties. In every case the answer was no.

One said he did refuse some on his own initiative but the owner of the stuff went off and got a note from the then Minister of Public Works demanding that those potatoes be accepted and that ended his attempt to do the thing right. I may say in passing that every institution has orders now to reject any unsuitable vegetables and holding them responsible if these instructions are not carried out. One peculiar circumstance in connection with the price of potatoes last Fall was that during the month of October at the same date some parties received $6.00, others $6.50 and some $7.00; apparently each man was paid according to his particular value but the vegetables were not considered. I may inform the House that owing to the unsuitable quality of these potatoes about half of them are unfit for human consumption and will cost the country from $10.00 to $15.00 per barrel.

I have had a few curious visitors since taking office. I don't know if I should tell the story of the "script." (A voice: "Yes, let's have it.") Well, sitting in the office one evening during my first week there a man looked in around the door and asked if Mr. Woodford was in. I said no, is there anything I can do for you. Thus encouraged he entered the office and walked up to the table. Well what is it my man? "I thought sir you may be able to give me a bit of a script." I replied no I cannot do that for you. Well, he said, we used to get them here, Mr. Woodford used to give them, and I got a very bad cold. He however went away disappointed and evidently spread the news, as I have received no applications since.

On another occasion I was waited on by two men who apparently represented others on the same errand. They had come from Bell Island on their way home to Harbour Main and wanted some help towards paying their fare. I had to inform them that there were no funds in the Department of Public Works for such purposes and that if they were destitute the only advice I could give would be to apply to the Commissioner of Charities, upon which they admitted that they were not totally destitute but were following a practice largely in vogue in the past when they and other parties did get help in this respect from the Dept. of Public Works. I could only tell them that if this was done by my predecessor he must have either paid the money out of his own pocket or out of some fund which he had no right to tamper with. I mention these facts as an example to what an extent irregularities have been practised in the past and to what extent the Dept. of Public Works has been prostituted.

Reference has been made to free entries. I have had some little experience of that too. More than one request has been made to allow certain goods to be admitted duty free and I have been told that all that was necessary was for me just to initial the invoice and the thing would be done. When first confronted with a request of this nature I made some enquiries and found that it was not the custom to admit anything duty free, it was irregular, unsafe and opened a wide door for something worse. It is just as well for the goods to go through the regular channels, collect the duty and let it go into the revenue as to remit the duty, giving a possible advantage to the contractor. All contracts drawn in connection with the Public Works Dept., so I am informed, are drawn with the understanding that duty is paid on all imports by the contractor, but there is one thing revealed in those requests and that is that some have been getting concessions contrary to regulations and that some one in authority has winked at

such proceedings or perhaps been more seriously involved.

Mr. Speaker it is high time these irregular practices should cease. The time is ripe for a clean up; we hope to do something substantial in this respect and if at the end of four years we cannot present to the people of this country a better condition of affairs, a cleaner state, then we shall have proved ourselves unworthy of the responsibility of self government and should return to the status of a Crown Colony.

MONDAY, May 3rd, 1920.

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

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to lay on the table of the House copies of the treaties of peace between the allied powers and the associated powers: Germany, Austria, Bulgaria and certain other governments relating thereto. Also report of public schools of Newfoundland for year ending December 31, 1919. Also report of the Department of Agriculture and Mines for fiscal year ending June 30, 1919. Also return of licenses issued during 1918 return of crown lands grants issued 1918-1919; returning of mining licenses issued 1918-1919; report of the 1st and 2nd surveyors of the Department of Agriculture and Mines; report of the chief woods ranger; returns of lumber operations; reports of Government analyst.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question of my hon. friend, Mr. Sullivan, member for the district of Placentia and St. Mary's, of April 27th, referring to undertakings of a police nature in Newfoundland in which Mr. Crowe, either personally or in a representative capacity is interested.

The hon. member has been given access to the files and has, I understand, secured the information sought so that question is considered answered.

MR. SULLIVAN:—That is so, thank you.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present three petitions. These petitions concern not only the people of Fortune, but practically all the south coast of the Island. The three petitions all read the same, and refer to the coming shortage of supply of timber. The petitions ask that Government action be taken. It seems that some private individuals have taken up limits there, and in addition to operating two mills on the limits held, are also operating mills within the three mile limit.

In presenting these petitions I desire to say that I will do my best to see that some relief is given the people of Bay d'Espoir.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Clark's Beach in the district of Port de Grave. Before presenting the petition I would like to ask the leader of the government whether it is the Government's intention to introduce a prohibition bill.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—The matter has not been finally considered.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—I will read the petition. It is signed by the Methodist clergyman and a large number of others. In presenting this petition I reserve my right for further comment until the government decides what action to take.

MR. WINSOR:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people at Newtown. This petition is for a motor boat about 10 or 12 tons to take freight and passengers to connect with the coastal boat at Wesleyville. At the present time I understand it is the intention to make Newtown a port of call for the bay boat. Unless that is done, this petition should be granted.

MR. ABBOTT:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support this petition.

MR. LeGROW:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Grate's Cove for $7500.00 to build a launchway at that place. This launchway is absolutely necessary, as the fishermen are now without any facilities for fishing purposes. This petition is largely signed, and I hope it will receive the full consideration of the department to which it relates.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay upon the table of the House copies of correspondence between the Great War Veterans' Association and the Government in relation to matters appeartaining to pensions and allowances to sailors, soldiers and dependents.

My hon. friends asks me the following questions:

(1) If the request for a temporary measure only, and until the scale of pensions is amended, is it the intention of the Government to allow the following increases:
   (a) Total disability, 20 per cent. increase.
   (b) Orphans of sailors and soldiers, 20 per cent. increase.
   (c) Children of deceased sailors and soldiers, 20 per cent. increase.
   (d) All other cases where deceased or totally disabled sailors or soldiers was or is the sole support, 20 per cent. increase.
(2) Also is it the intention of the Government to make this increase retroactive from Nov. 15, 1919.
(3) And is it the intention of the Government to carry out the policy in connection with returned soldiers and sailors as outlined in the Prime Minister's manifesto issued in October, 1919.

It is not probable that the Government will undertake any temporary measures. The whole question of pensions to soldiers and sailors, disability allowances, gratuities, pensions and allowances to dependents and financial and other assistance to enable the returned soldiers and sailors to get back to a peace basis, is receiving and has for some time past been receiving the careful consideration of the Government. In my manifesto of October last October, quoted by my hon. questioner I proposed that Newfoundland soldiers and sailors should be put upon the same basis as to pensions, gratuities, etc., as appertained in the neighboring dominion. Detailed information is being secured as to the status of the soldiers, not only in Canada, but in Great Britain, and Ireland, France, Italy, Belgium, the United States, New Zealand, Australia, South Africa, India and other British possessions. For the additional information of the hon. members I table certain information not included within the scope of his questions, namely, information prepared for me by the Department of Militia giving a summary of the status of soldiers and their dependents in the matter of disability allowances, pensions, gratuities, etc., amongst the leading nations engaged in the recent war, particularly Great Britain and the dominions. It will be noted that Canada makes by far the highest payments on the whole, and that Newfoundland ranks second. In some particulars the maximum payments made by Newfoundland were as high as Canada; in other instances they were lower. I am informed from both Canadian and Newfoundland sources that in actual practice the average payments to soldiers and their dependents were higher in Newfoundland than in Canada, because the standard of disability in the case of soldiers and sailors and the standard of dependency in the case of dependents is on a basis very much more favorable to soldiers, sailors and their dependents in Newfoundland than it is in Canada. This whole question

is being carefully considered, as it is the intention of the Government to do everything in its power to assist the soldiers and sailors in these matters, having due regard to local conditions.

MR. ABBOTT:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Salvage in the district of Bonavista, asking that a fog alarm be placed on Little Denier Island. A fog alarm on this island is an absolute necessity for fishermen and others trying to make harbor in the bottom of Bonavista Bay as there is a very dangerous group of breakers off the eastern end of the island. The petition is very largely signed and is endorsed by letters from the people of Wesleyville, Squid Tickle and St. Brendan's, all of whom are of the opinion that this fog alarm is an absolute necessity, and I trust the Government will find it possible to give this request favorable consideration and that it will be handed to the department of Marine and Fisheries, where I know my friend and colleague, the minister, will give it his best attention, and see that Little Denier is adorned with a fog alarm.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Cockle's Cove in the district of Twillingate, asking for a small post office. The post office was formerly in a private dwelling house and the man who owned the house and kept the post office is since deceased. They cannot make any other arrangement to establish the office in a private house and the building asked for is the smallest practical for the purpose for which it is needed. Seeing that they are having telephone communication there the coming season it is absolutely necessary that these people have a place of this kind for their convenience. I have much pleasure, sir, in giving this petition my hearty support and ask that it be referred to the Department of Posts and Telegraphs.

MR. HIBBS:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Joe Batt's Arm. This is a very lengthy petition and is signed by some 150 persons and asks that a breakwater be built out over a ledge of rock from Broom's Point, some two hundred feet, to give shelter to and make a safe anchorage for boats. During December and January of the past season a heavy storm was experienced there and a heavy sea hove in, destroying wharves, flakes, stages, boats and other property . The harbor is a rough one and every time a sea heaves in there this is a common occurrence. It is well known to this House that Joe Batt's Arm is a very important settlement, there being, I think, something like 250 fishermen there, and I am sure that this is as important a petition as has been presented here this session. The request is for the sum of $5,000 to perform this very necessary work. I know the place quite well, as my attention was called to it during the campaign last fall. I hope that the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs will bear me out in this, and I have very much pleasure, sir, in giving this petition my hearty support and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

I have another petition, Mr. Speaker, from the people of Man Point, Gander Bay. Man Point is a settlement on the south side of Gander Bay and this petition is signed by the men of that place and those of Long Point asking for the modest sum of $400.00 to complete the public road from Man Point to Long Point. Although there is a lot of commerce and traffic between those places the only means of communication by travel is a right-of-way cut through the woods. I think in the early days there was a road there but the ground over which the line is cut is so boggy that it is necessary to wear long rubbers when going over it. There is quite an industry at Long Point, where

Mr. French operates a large mill, and besides people going up Gander Bay have to take this road when they cannot go by boat. I have much pleasure sir, in giving this petition my hearty support, and I ask that it be referred to the Department of Public Works, where I trust it will receive the attention its importance entitles it to.

Mr. Speaker, I have still another petition from the residents of Fogo, signed by Magistrate Cook and some 80 or 90 others, asking for the small sum of $100.00 to complete a road to a very important well. The obtaining of a sufficient water supply is one of the greatest difficulties that the people of Fogo have to contend with and in fact all down the coast from Tilting, Joe Batt's Arm and Barr'd Island to Fogo, the same trouble is experienced. It is extremely hard to get water and more especially during a dry summer, and for this reason the petition I now present is an important one. I have very much pleasure in giving it my hearty support, and I ask that it be referred to Department of Public Works.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS:—Mr. Speaker, I wish to support the prayer of the petition presented by the hon. member for Fogo. I may say that this is an outstand ing need. Other settlements received considerable attention last year when a grant of $500,000 was made for the public works of the colony, but unfortunately for this district I had not the privilege of allocating this grant. I understand a great sum of money which should have been sent to Fogo for public needs was diverted to other districts. If I had the privilege of handling this money I can assure Mr. Hibbs there would be no necessity for presenting his petition this afternoon.

MR. SCAMMELL:—I have pleasure in supporting the petition of Mr. Hibbs in the matter of the cleaning out of Curley's Brook. I know quite a bit of the needs of this district. I spent five years at school in Fogo district. I know many people go down there to get water from this brook and I heartily support the prayer of the petition.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Speaker, before the funds of the treasury have been exhausted in granting the requests of Mr. Hibbs and his associates I would ask leave to present a petition from the people of Fox Hr. and Argentia for the sum of $500 to build a very necessary road in communication with a saw mill at that place. This mill was erected by the people to supply lumber for their own personal use. The petition has been signed by Rev. Fr. Savin and 60 or 70 other residents of the place. I trust the Department of Public Works will see its way clear to have this given due consideration.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to support the prayer of the petition presented by Mr. Walsh.

MR. SINNOTT:—I beg leave to support this petition.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave Notice of Question.

Mr. MacDonnell gave Notice of Question.

Dr. Jones gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Bennett gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Vinnicombe gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Walsh gave Notice of Question.

Mr. Fox gave Notice of Question.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Lance Cove, Bell Island, for the reconstruction of the public wharf at that place. I have personal knowledge of this need to the people of Lance Cove and I accordingly support this petition with great heartiness. I also wish to take this opportunity to draw the attention of the Government to the conditions now prevailing at Bell Island. Some few years ago a local council was appointed having jurisdiction over the whole of the island. This was later divided into two

sections, one section looking after the mining district and the other section the front of the Island. Some few months previous to the termination of office of the councils which I presume did terminate, the people of Lance Cove and Freshwater were advocating a division of the west end council, and this was before the government. The situation over there at present is that the councils having accepted their term of office as expired have declined to take an interest in public works. I think, Mr. Speaker, this should be given the very serious consideration of the Government. The beach wharf and the Lance Cove wharf are both gone and no effort has been made to replace them. The beach wharf, though useful, is not so absolutely necessary but the immediate replacement of the Lance Cove wharf is absolutely essential. It is the only means of bringing provisions into this part of the island because to drag them over land from any other section would not only be a burdensome job but also a costly one. I ask the Government to consider this petition, but I am not personally concerned in what attitude you take in the matter of local councils, in making a third council or not, but immediate attention is absolutely urgent. Bell Island is a place where more than ordinary attention should be given, and I urge you to give this matter your earliest consideration. It has been reported to me, Mr. Speaker, that even the ordinary pauper has been neglected. The Commissioner of Public Charities in a conversation with me the other day stated that one of the councils have not yet applied for their last quarter grant. I invite the consideration of the Government in this matter.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to support the prayer of this petition presented by my colleague and I emphasize the importance of the matter and ask the Government to give it serious consideration.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support this petition.

MR. HIBBS:—Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word in reference to the petition of my hon. friend Mr. Higgins, as I have personal knowledge of the needs of the people of Bell Island having visited there quite often. The wharf at Lance Cove is not only important from the standpoint of Bell Island but it is much used by people from all over the country who go there to seek employment. I think there is a movement on foot to take over the tramway.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the bill entitled "An Act to amend the Judicature Act" was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the bill entitled "An Act to Incorporate the Women's Patriotic Association of Newfoundland" was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, "An Act to amend Chapter 4 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled "Of Legislative Disabilities and the Vacation of Seats in the House of Assembly," was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider the bill entitled "An Act respecting the Department of Posts and Telegraphs."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:— Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this bill entitled "An Act respecting the Department of Posts and Telegraphs," I would point out that the bill itself is a very brief one and consists of the formal creation by Act of Parliament of a Department of Posts & Telegraphs, which department was created by Minute of Council in November last. I feel that every member of the Legislature will concur with me when I say that the Postal Telegraph Service throughout the country is such a large spending department and of such magnitude as a public utility that it should cease to be a mere branch of the responsibilities of the Colonial Secretary and should become a Department of the Crown with a ministerial head directly responsible to the people for the conduct of the department.

Section 1 of the bill provides for the creation of the department, over which a minister shall preside.

Section 2 places within the jurisdiction of the new department the supervision, control and direction of all matters relating to the Postal and Telegraph service of the colony. The office of Postmaster General under the provisions of Chapter 35 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) are by this section vested in the new minister.

Section 3 empowers His Excellency the Governor in Council to appoint a Deputy, and such officers, clerks and other employees as are necessary for the conduct of the proper business of the department.

Section 4 enacts the necessary verbal change in Chapter 35 above referred to, so that whenever the word "department" is referred to in that chapter it will hereafter refer to the Department of Posts and Telegraphs and not to the Department of the Colonial Secretary.

By sections 5 and 6 certain sections of Chapter 35 are repealed.

Under section 7 the sub-section of Chapter 35 relating to franked letters is repealed and a section substituted therefor covering the law as it actually stands to-day. The repealed subsection provided for the franking of letters to and from the Colonial Secretary, the Minister of Justice and certain other officials. The sub-section substituted therefor includes all the departments created since the original enactment of the repealed sub-section and adds such other public officials as the Commissioner of Public Charities, the Superintendents of Education, who were years ago granted the franking privilege by order in council, and such others as His Excellency the Governor in Council may determine should avail of franking facilities.

I trust that this bill will be accorded a unanimous second reading, as I feel that every member of the House appreciates the necessity for the creation of a Department of Posts and Telegraphs and the reorganization with a view to higher efficiency which it is hoped this step will make possible.

The Chairman of the Committee reported that they had considered the matter ti them referred, and had passed the bill with some amendment.

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

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, May 4, 1920.

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

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled the

report of public schools, under Church of England boards, 1919.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the table of this House the amount of free entries passed through the customs for the following years, 1916, 1917, 1918, 1919.

Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs tabled the information.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the table of this House a list showing the number of officials appointed in his department, both in St. John's and outports, giving the names and positions of each, since November 15th, 1919. Also salary of each.

Hon. Minister of Finance Customs tabled the information.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the table of this House a statement of the number of persons that sold government bonds in 1917 and 1918, and the amount of commission paid each.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS:—In reply to the hon. gentleman I beg to state that the information asked for is in course of preparation and will be tabled to-morrow.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of this House a list giving number of vessels built in Newfoundland since 1918, giving names, tonnage and amount of bounty paid on each, and amount of material passed duty free for the construction of each vessel.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—The answer to this question is being prepared, Mr. Speaker, and will be ready to-morrow.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of this House a statement showing the amount paid to the Reid Nfld. Co. for extending the railroad from Catalina Station to Port Union.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY:—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the hon. gentleman I beg to state that the amount paid the Reid Nfld. Co. for this extension was $90,848.87. This sum does not include the value of the land.

Mr. MacDonnell asked the Acting Minister of Shipping to lay on the table of the House all information relevant to the chartering of a vessel to carry freight to Grand Bank, and what amount of subsidy is paid for said vessel.

HON. MINISTER O FSHIPPING:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to say that this information is being prepared and will be ready to-morrow.

Dr. Jones asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House a statement giving particulars of amounts paid in connection with the small pox outbreak in the District of Harbor Main, during the periods mentioned below, and authorized by Magistrate O'Toole.

1.—The number of cases attended.

2.—The number of successful vaccinations performed.

3.—The amounts paid for such attendance, and vaccinations, and to whom paid.

4.—The amounts paid for medicines, and to whom paid.

5.—The amounts paid for travelling expenses and board, and to whom paid.

(During the period between Sept. 30th, 1918, and May 31st, 1918):

1.—The number of cases attended.

2.—The number of successful vaccinations performed.

3.—The amounts paid for such attendance and vaccination, and to whom paid.

4.—The amounts paid for medicines furnished, and to whom paid.

5.—The amounts paid for travelling expenses and board, and to whom paid.

(During the period from May 31st, 1919, to April 1, 1920.)

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY:—

I might say, Mr. Speaker in reply to the hon. gentleman, that the information he asks for will take considerable time to prepare, and if the member for Harbor Main will call at the office of the Commissioner of Charities he will be able to obtain the information he seeks much more readily than my department could supply it to him.

DR. JONES:—Will I be at liberty to copy the information I want?

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY:—Yes, and I shall be glad to place a clerk at the hon. gentleman's disposal.

Mr. Vinnicombe asked the Minister of Public Works if Supt. of Public Works Mr. Churchill is still superintending the work now being done on the Sanitorium and Lunatic Asylum. If not who is doing such work, when the appointment was made and why such appointment was made.

The Minister of Public Works tabled the information.

Mr. Walsh asked the Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House:

(a) Statement showing the location of the dredge Priestman from the 15th day of November last to date.

(b) The number of days employed and where employed.

(c) The number of days not employed and why not employed.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—The information is in course of preparation

Mr. Bennett asked Hon. the Prime Minister (in the absence of the minister of militia) if all claims for pensions have been considered by the board of pension commissioners and if not, how many claims are still out standing up to the present date.

HON. the Prime Minister tabled the information.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —In reply to the question of Sir Michael Cashin, I would state that the amount paid by the late government to the Reid Nfld. Co. for railway extension from Catalina station to Port Union railway temius was $90,848,87.

MR. WINSOR:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of St. Brendans, Squid Tickles and Flat Island asking from Alexander Bay via. Squid Tickles. This Road is badly needed and would be of great service especially during the spring and fall when this is the only way the people of the settlements I have named have to go to the railway station at Alexander Bay and besides under present conditions the mail couriers are cut off from the settlements along their routes and this road would unable them to give much more effictient service. The petition is signed by all the people of the place from which it comes and I have much pleasure in giving it my hearty support and ask that it be referred to the Department of Public Works.

MR. ABBOTT:—I have much pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in giving this petition my hearty support and I trust that the government will see its way clear to comply with its request.

DR. JONES:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Chapel's Cove, in the District of Hr. Main, asking that the public wharf there be repaired. During the storms of the past season this wharf was badly damaged and as the tishermen if they could not use it. would suffer much inconvenience I therefore give this petition my hearty support and ask that it be referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

DR. JONES:—I ask leave to present another petition from the inhabitants of Chapel's Cove objecting to the proposed removal of the post office. Chapel's Cove is a large settlement and is divided into two sections. Chapel's Cove Proper and Chapel's Cove Pond. During my 25

or 26 years in that district the post office has always been in the same house and no change was ever made no matter what political changes there might have been but the present government has seen fit to remove the office from where it has been so long. Chapel's Cove Pond has a post office of its own and the new arrangement the post office for Chapels Cove proper will really be in the Chapel s Cove Pond section. This is unfair to the people and this petition protesting against it is signed by ninety-nine and a half per cent. of the residents of Chapel's Cove. I trust that it will receive the consideration of this House and that the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs will see fit to take into consideration the protest embodied in this petition.

HON. MR. FOOTE—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Marystown for a road of about four miles to connect with the main road to Burin. By having this road a distance of twenty miles would be saved and the people of Fox Hr., Grand Bank, Garnish and other places would be greatly benefited. This petition is largely signed and the signatures include those of business people, clergy and other important residents. I trust that this request will receive the consideration it merits, and I have much pleasure in giving it my hearty support.

MR. CHEESEMAN—Mr. Speaker, this petition is a very important one, and I have much pleasure in giving it my hearty support.

MR. WALSH—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Sound Island asking for a sum of money to pay the hire of a wharf which is used there by the public in place of a government wharf. The wharf that was in use is so delapidated that it is no longer of service and the place where the Argyle now calls is owned by a business firm there, the Sound Island Stores, a branch of a city house. If the government could see its way clear to pay these people something for the hire of the wharf the private people using it would look upon it in a different light as at present they do not care to use the wharf with that freedom they would wish. I have much pleasure in giving this petition my hearty support and ask that it be referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

MR. SULLIVAN,—I also give this petition my hearty support.

MR. SINNOTT:—I beg to give this petition my support, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Speaker, on the motion for the third reading of the bill entitled "An Act respecting the Department of Posts and Telegraphs," I would ask that this reading be deferred till to-morrow for reasons which I now propose to lay before the chair.

When this bill approached the second reading yesterday I ask for certain information relative to to this but Prime Minister forestalled this request. I would like however to deal with this matter and to deal with it in a manner which I hope the House will appreciate, as any remarks addressed are not intended in a spirit of malice. Dr. Robinson was a man of estimable character who occupied the position of postmaster-general with great credit to himself and untold advantage to the public in general, leaving nothing to be desired. The correspondence dealing with this matter is part of the matter with which I wish to deal this afternoon. I will draw your attention, Mr. Speaker, to what may be an accidental inaccuracy in the reply tabled by the Prime Minister. The following letter is supposed to be a copy of the reply to a telephone message by the Prime Minister to Hon. Dr. Robinson. (Reads letter.)

The concluding paragraph is particularly important in the light of the comment I am forced to make on an inaccuracy which has crept into it. This is no mere displacement of words, but an interpolation which has changed the whole sense of the letter. Broadly speaking the position is this. When Dr. Robinson received the telephone message from the Deputy Colonial Secretary, asking that he would call in and see him, the Postmaster General declined to do so, but not for reasons as made out to be in the letter.

The letter which Hon. Dr. Robinson wrote to the Deputy Colonial Secretary sets that position clear.

Now the position was that Dr. Robinson refused to meet the Colonial Secretary to discuss the intolerable situation which had arisen out of the publication of the news and which had been flashed to every telegraph station in the country stating that another man had been appointed in his place. Until that situation had been withdrawn Dr. Robinson could not hold his position.

Now Mr. Speaker, I have been creditably informed that the information tabled by the Hon. the Prime Minister in this connection is incorrect and requires an explanation.

I am determined, and I have made an attempt to realize I am not in opposition, but that I am one sent here to fulfil my duty to the public, and in the spirit which should prompt all legislature going through the Assembly. I have sincerely attempted to associate myself with the Government in that attempt. I am prepared to forget that I am in opposition in this respect, but I want to insist that when I ask for information to be tabled in this House, I want that information correct. The interpolation objected to by me has been put in a letter given to me by the Prime Minister. You will realize yourself, sir, how out-of-place these words are in that paragraph. (Reads letter.)

I want, and I insist upon it as my right that deception be not practiced. I will not stand for it, and I will not permit deception to be practiced upon me. I am prepared to associate myself with any bonafide legislation which may be passed through this House.

In asking for an adjournment of the third reading of this Bill, I ask that my request for information in connection with this correspondence will have to be furnished to me in correct form. The copies tabled are incorrect, and incorrect in the most important particulars. I do not want to think that this was anything but a typographical error, but this sort of thing must not continue. The information tabled must be correct and above suspicion.

I now ask sir, that the original correspondence coming from Dr. Robinsin to the departmental head or subdepartmental head be tabled and that the copies of the correspondence sent to him be tabled; in particular do I ask that the original letter, dater November 20th, 1919, from the Postmaster-General at that time to the Deputy Colonial Secretary be tabled. The object of my remarks is for the protection and preservation of this House and for the purpose of keeping the department in question under control. I ask the Hon. Colonial Secretary to institute the fullest possible investigation in this matter, and, in view of the situation that has arisen, it would not be consistent to proceed with the third reading of the bill. I ask, therefore, that until the information asked for is tabled that the third reading of the bill be deferred.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:— Mr. Speaker, if there be in accuracies in the correspondence, I will have the official responsible for the errors sus-

pended on to-morrow, pending investigation.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Speaker, may I say, sir, that I do not ask that such drastic action be taken.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Well I will take it. I am not supposed to have handed me by my clerks, inaccurate information and have myself subjected to the personal discourtious criticism dealt out to me this afternoon for a matter of which I have no knowledge. Would my hon. friend inform me as to the particular inaccuracy to which he referred by writing it on the paper, as tabled yesterday, also, to inform the House as to the source of his information.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Speaker, I may say that I am not at liberty to disclose the source, beyond the fact that it came from a source that I cannot dispute. It came from an authoritative source and from one that I accept in all bona fides.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, I take it the hon. member has a copy.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Speaker, the original copy and the carbon copy of the late Postmaster-General's letter to the Deputy Colonial Secretary do not agree. The interpolation inserted in the third line, was not a word or two, but a whole line and so merits the personal attention of the Prime Minister.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, I will be thankful if he will write it on the correspondence, and I can assure the hon. member that if anybody in that department, whether he be deputy, typist or any other official, is guilty, he will be suspended on to-morrow pending investigation. I do not feel that the third reading should be delayed, as the information will be tabled to-morrow. The bill has already passed committee stage, and the original referred to will be tabled to-morrow.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Speaker, in thanking the Hon. Prime Minister and Colonial Secretary, I wish to reply to his last comment. Whereas I think it necessary and absolutely desirable to have an investigation in this matter, I do not ask for nor do I request that any drastic action be taken against any official of the department of which he is the head. All I ask is that he give his personal attention to get the desired information. I would not have done so only that the inaccuracies are very material. As regards the dismissal of any official, that is a matter for which he is responsible and it is under his control. I think I have to ask the courtesy, if not the consideration, of the Prime Minister that the third reading of the bill be adjourned until the information asked for be given me on to-morrow. It is not an irrelevant matter to which I have referred, but material to the bill in question. I, therefore, have to ask that consideration be given to my motion and have the third reading deferred.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend feels that he would not have as full an opportunity of discussing the matter unless the third reading be deferred. Thus I am glad to extend him the courtesy and deferring the third reading until to-morrow.

MR. FOX:—I thank you, sir.

Committee of the whole on bill "An Act respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding."

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—Mr. Speaker, I wish to review the bill now before the committee and briefly explain it.

Section 2 of the bill provides for an alteration of the tonnage bounty limit by allowing the bounty to vessels as large as 130 to 160 tons. The reason of the Government having so decided is because the bulk of the vessels needed for the foreign fish carrying

trade comes within the class. The day for large vessels has disappeared. The freighting of fish to Spain, Italy and Greece will, in future, be done by steamers.

It is found that large vessels built during the war are no longer needed in the foreign business of the colony. There may be occasion for some in the Brazilian trade, but I hope that before long, even Brazil exports will be handled by steamers. When in London, I interviewed Sir Frederick Lewis of the Furness Line, respecting steam connection between St. John's, New York, West Indies and Brazil, and I hope that desirability will mature within a year or two. While Brazil sail trade vessels exist we will have to use them for that purpose, but I feel convinced that the day of building vessels over 150 or 160 tons for foreign trade is gone; therefore, it would be wrong for the Government to encourage the building of large sailing vessels for our foreign trade, therefore we propose to fix the limit of qualification for the bounty at 160 tons gross.

But we propose to repay duty paid for material used in the construction of larger vessels and vessels over 160 tons shall receive rebate of duty.

It is also provided in this bill that in order to secure the rebate of duties on vessels over 160 tons, they must be built in accordance with schedule A or B of the Shipbuilding Act. At the present time, the law allows a man to build any sort of a vessel, but, under this bill, a man, if he does not build for the bounty, he must build according to schedule and have his vessel undergo rigid inspection. To qualify in future a vessel must be built well or not be used. Builders will not be allowed to use plan 3 in. thick when it should be four, nor place timbers six inches apart instead of four. No man will be allowed to float his vessel unless he has complied with the law. We want to have vessels built according to schedule.

The difference between schedule A and schedule B is not much. Schedule B is a local schedule, capable of turning out good vessels and was established within the past ten years for the building of local vessels. A vessel built under schedule B if faithfully constructed would be a first class vessel in every respect.

Section 12 of the Shipbuilding Act provides for the refund of duties on vessels upon which bounty has been claimed. During the last two years a number of vessels built in Newfoundland have not received the bounty and consequently have not received rebate. Some 8 or 10 vessels have not been in receipt of either bounty or dutp, so that provision is made in Section 3 for the repayments of duties on material used in the construction of such vessels. All who built such vessels believed they were not payable under the act. I could have asked the Governor in Council to refund such duties by Minute of Council but considered as we were amending the act that the proper course was to provide for the repaymeent of such duties by inserting a claim in this bill.

The outsanding features of the new bill are that we raise the tonnage for bounty from 130 to 160 tons; that we will refund all duty on vessels over that tonnage that are built under Schedule B; the next feature is that vessels built during the past year or two that have not received the refund shall receive it.

MR. MacDONNELL—Mr. Chairman, while this bill is before the House I would like to make a few observations in connection therewith. To my mind, sir, this bill is dangerous, because on general principle retroactive legislative is wrong. I am sorry, very sorry indeed that this bill is retroactive. On general principle

were the bill from now onwards, I would support it heartily, but retroactive legislation is, to my mind a step in the wrong direction. I am thoroughly in accord with the extending of bounties, because in any respect the matter of production is the only solution to the problem which most deeply concerns all right-thinking citizens, namely the problem of the high cost of living. In so far as this bill stands for the extending of bounties for shipbuilding, Iam in support of it, but there is something about that post factum or retroactive legislation that I do not appreciate and which I do object to. The question of bounties has brought to my mind a subject, which beyond all other subjects has been uppermost in my mind during the present session. I refer to the encouragement of Agriculture. As I have intimated before, I think that this House ought encourage all industries, because the more production the lower will be the cost of living, and this question of the encouragement of agriculture will get my heartiest support at all times. And in so far as the puestion of bounties has been considered, I think I am entitled and am perfectly within my rights when I express my regrets that the question of a bounty in the matter of agriculture and the matter of clearing of land has not been put in the speech from the throne. As I have already said, the question of the extension of bounties merits my approval. Some years ago as no doubt you are aware, there was a bounty of $20 an acre given for the man who cleared land and cropped it. I think that it was in the first session of the Morris Government that that act was repealed. Now we are confronted with one problem, which overshadows all other problems in importance, and that is the high cost of living.

There is only one solution, and absolutely ons solution to that, and that is increased production. Therefore, I submit that whilst expressing myself in accord with the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries in extending bounties on shipbuilding, I am entitled to draw the attention of this House to the fact that so far there has been nothing foreshadowed of any intention on the part of this House or the exesutive government to introduce any bill that would give that very important, that almost indispensible government grant or bonus for land clearing. I am perfectly aware, sir, that I cannot, as a member of the opposition, introduce a bill to the effect that a bonus should be paid for the purpose of clearing land. A bill which involves the expenditure of the revenue must be introduced by the government side. I think that it is for these reasons, sir, that when this bill and the question of bounties come before this House that I deem it my duty, while recording my sentiments on the principle of the bill to draw the attention of the House to the fact that there is nothing mentioned of introducing a bill, which subsequently become an act for the benefit of those who clear more land and crop the same in subsequent years. We have had some discussions on the platform, in the press and in this House relative to the high cost of living. I submit, sir, that all these discussions were purely academic We have been dealing with general principles; we have been dealing with ideal conditions and we have been dealing with what we wish was the case, but which we know was not the case. Now Mr. Chairman, there is an opportunity right here. I want to throw out the suggestion and I want to have myself placed on record in this House as the one who threw out the suggestion, that the govern-

ment, before this session comes to a close—and Sir, I want to state that I will ask a frined of mine in the governmene benches who will father it—to introduce a bill to this effect and that will be the one real antidote to this problem, which, above all other problems overshadows the life and existance, and controls the well-being and decides the attitude of many a man in this country with regards to right and wrong, low and disorder, the problem of the high cost of living

I sumbit, Mr. Chairman, that the most popular measure ever introduces at any time in this legislature would be placed upon the statue books of this country an act which provides that a man for clearing land and the cropping of same shall be given a bounty. Ten years ago it was put on the statutes that a man got $20 an acre for clearing land and cropping it. If that amount was compared with the relative value or money for 1920, it would be quite a sum; but, sir, I do not propose to ask too much of the government; to the hon. gentleman on the other side; but I will say this, that if the government would introduce a bill replacing that act that was on the statue book, and that instead of $20 an acre make it $35 an acre, they will not be giving relative value as compared with dollar for dollar with ten years ago, but they will be putting on the statue book of this House the most popular measure as regards the electorate and the most reasonable that I have yet seen foreshadowed as regards the high cost of living. My reason for suggesting that question of bonus is because I am in throught accord with the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries when he suggests the extension and enlargment of the bounties with regards to shipbuilding. With strikes on the one hand and with stringency of finance on the other, there is absolutely no solution to this question of how a man can live.

If there is a solution so as to give a man, who gives the best that is in him, a better standard of living, it is this increased production. And, sir, the government that finds itself deaf to this call, which may be inarticulate to some, if they find themselves deaf to the call of the men who work ten or twelve hours a day and still cannot get enough to eat, and such a government decides to pass over the suggestion that I have laid before this House, a serious situation will arise. There is in this country a suggestion, an implication, with some it is an article of faith, that the idea of encouraging agriculture solves the sigh cost of living. It produces the necessaries of life . I came to this House as the representative of the district, which beyond all other districts, is a farming district. I know the possibilities of that district. I know, sir, that if there be any development in the future of this country that that future development must come from the West Coast. You will find that on the platform in the press and in this Assembly there was nothing except scoffs and jeers at the idea that the west coast can do anything in the way of production.

I will tell you, sir, for the past eight years we have been handicapped because of nothing upon the statute books to encourage agriculture. There are upwards of one thousand acres of land situate along the Codroy River which upon analysis by a man with a university training, with a university degree of bachelor of science, were found to compare absolutely in every detail with the soil of Prince Edward Island. We know, sir, the members of this House know the people of this country know, we have been forced to recognize that Prince Edward Island farming stands out in big large letters and the soil there is, as I stated before,

sir, in all sincerity, of the same calibre as our land on the west coast in every particular. Are you sir, are the hon. men elected to this House by their constituencies ,whose beliefs are certain of the future of the westward, is this House going to do nothing for the encouragement of the western sections? I regret that you sir, are chairman, not that you cannot fulfil the requirements expected of such a position, but I regret that you are not in the body of this House to voice the sentiments which I now express. I believe the House has not got sufficient knowledge of the conditions of this country with regard to agriculture. But sir, this matter of the encouragement of agriculture, this matter which if considered properly, will at least give the people of the west coast a decent chance, will receive the support of the men on the other side of the House; yes, I am sure every honest, square-minded man in this House will give the measure his hearty support. I do know sir, that to-day that it will easily cost any man fifty or fifty-five dollars to clear an acre of land and have it ready for burning. I know sir, to have provisions and prices moderate and to assist in reducing the high cost of living it is necessary to relieve this situation by removing the handicap which now exists.

Now sir, fifty-five dollars is the best value I could get. This is my suggestion to the House, it is only a suggestion. Well I hope an act will be passed embodying this suggestion and then it will become the law of the land and instead of having a minimum of twenty dollars per acre there will be at least thirty-five dollars per acre granted. Now this question was suggested to me last October when I was going through my campaign, but acting upon my principle that I would make no promises, I gave no assurance then; but now sir I bring this matter to the attention of the House in order that some may voice their opinions and those of their constituents. I do not know what their opinions are but I think it the first thing to be done in the matter of the reduction of the high cost of living. But this matter in the past has not been treated properly by the House and it has been the practice of the newspapers and the general public to regard agriculture in this country as a joke. I have seen men take the virgin forest from the government and convert them into prosperous farms. They paid thirty cents an acre, and I have seen them pay ten per cent. for their money which they had to borrow simply because there was not an act on the statute books promoting farming and thereby providing for an advance to the men of money at a small percentage.

Let us look around and see all the other dominions of the British Empire and see how they provide for the interests of the agriculturist. In four years we have to climb from the bottom rung of the ladder and try and achieve something and give a square show to those to the westward and give them a chance to produce crops in comparison with the rest. I have seen these men pay ten per cent. for their money and have fifty acres of land cleared and ready for burning. I have seen that land cropped for three years and then see the men get back fifty per cent. of their outlay. All this land simply requires the plough and team of horses and it is ready for cultivation. All of it is going to waste, all these thousands of acres, simply beacuse while we are here discussing bounty for shipbuilding which only concerns a few, and which is only a drop in the bucket, we do not discuss a decent bounty for the agriculturist.

These bounties only concern a few sections of the country, it is only a drop in the bucket, while nothing is be-

ing done to solve the question which interests every man north, south, east and west of this country. All this land which I have described afore lying idle because of the ignorance of the various governments of the conditions existing, and I say there can be enough food produced to feed this country. While we are discussing an unimportant thing we are neglecting a very important thing, while we are struggling after one atom we are neglecting a conglomeration of atoms which means a lot to the country. To prove to you this I can from experience say that for year after year crops are grown without any fertilizer, any manure or anything of that sort. The crops are sown in the same piece of land and yet the good results come. Surely that is absolute proof. There is not enough belief in the country. I know for a fact that particularly in my district we imported Russian wheat in order that we might see whether our belief in the country was true or false. We sowed the Russian wheat and have had just as good a crop as any in Western Canada.

Last year there was a tourist on the west coast and he saw the crop that was grown at Stephenville, South Branch and Little River, and he emphatically stated that it was as good as any grown in Western Canada.

Now, we have nothing on the statute books and there has been nothing fore shadowed of anything in the speech from the throne to encourage agriculture in any respect. I can assure you, sir, that this land can be cleared for fifty dollars per acre and this land which is near the river is abounding in leaf mould, and when the river overflows there is plenty of mud strewn over the land and the same land can produce three tons of hay which cannot be got in town to-day for sixty dollars per ton. This means three times sixty or sixty-five or a total of one hundred and ninety-five dollars worth can be produced from an expenditure of fifty dollars with regard to clearing.

We come here to consider this retroactive laws with regard to the building of ships which only concerns a couple sections of the country. I regret that the members of this House and more particularly the executive government have neglected to do something for the promotion of agriculture in this country. I am sure, sir, that some member will bring a bill of this sort before the House. A certain gentleman of the executive government promised me he would be willing to introduce a bill as I could not, being on the opposition, since it would involve an expenditure from the public revenue, and such bills can only come from the government side.

I can guarantee this House that we in the western section of Newfoundland can produce as much to the acre as can be produced in any part of Canada. We can produce three tons of hay to the acre, and it costs $50.00 an acre to clear it. I have had to pay $50.00 myself to have an acre of land cleared, and my only ambition is to have a decent farm cleared in which I can settle down. I know of thousands of acres which have never been granted. Any man taking 50 acres of land can earn a decent living, and be a big benefit to his country. I hope, Mr. Chairman, this suggestion will not fall upon stony ground, but that it will take root. If there is any future in this country, if there is going to be any advance, it must come from the west coast. The three districts, St. Barbe, St. George's, and Burgeo and LaPoile and coastline of the country, but what do we get of the marine and land grants? You know of the new reform movement, sir. It came to a head in your district before it did in mine. The people are getting their eyes open to the fact that they are not getting the grants that are

theirs by right. The time is coming when if we do not get the facilities for the development of the God-given gifts that we possess, and that have been endowed upon by nature, we will split the country in two halves. Let St. John's have her own government and we will have ours. I know the people in St. George's district. I have been through the district. They had a good man representing them, but they sent me back to tell the story of what they wanted and what they were rightfully going to demand. The country divides itself geographically east and west, and during the winter months we are turned out to starve, as some have starved.

Do you think, sir, that there is not a breaking point? I am sincere in this matter. I wish the government had shown some smyptoms of throwing over the cast iron rule that St. John's is the centre of the world. The soil in the suburbs of St. John's is from six twenty inches in depth. In the land I speak of you can drive a pole seven feet without striking a stone. Are we to sit here in this House and give no encouragement to the people of the west coast? Are we going to close this session of the House without passing some bill with regard to this matter? The statements which I have made regarding the production of the west coast may seem elaborate, but I assure you, sir, that they are correct. That is the land that we cannot get through today because the virgin forest still flourishes there. In as much as this government is a government of reform I want to bring in this suggestion, and to give it my support. I hope that before this House closes the government will bring in a bill to again place upon the statue books the giving of a bonus for clearing land. This is a bill which would benefit every district in the country directly and indirectly. Directly in that it would benefit the man himself, and indirectly in that it would make every district produce much of the food products that it requires. Do you think that by wilful or ignorant neglect of the government the people are going to allow this condition to continue? Do you think that three or four customs officers and one policeman can keep within bounds the just indignation of all the people of St. George's district. I know that you don't agree with this condition. The time has come when the people of the west coast are awake to the sacrifices they have made, and the injuries they have suffered. No combination of men can any longer deny them the privileges which they deserve, the privileges which have been denied them in the past.

We will no longer be relegated to the back woods and we demand now that that which is ours by right be given to us. Up to the present that section of the country has been completely ignored in regard to a matter more important, more vital than the question of shipbuilding.

Mr. Chairman, this afternoon I took occasion to refer to the fact that no legislation was foreshadowed for the encouragement of agricultural development, that no bounty was being provided for to encourage the clearing of land and when in this bill the House is now considering, I found that it was the intention to further consider the granting of a bounty for the building of vessels, it brought the matter home to me all the more forcibly. I am in hearty accord with the extension of bounties for the encouragement of any local industry because I am firmly convinced that by such a course only will we bring about increased production, and when the Minister of Marine and Fisheries said a few days ago that a bounty should be granted to fishermen as an inducement to them to improve the quality of their fish his statement

had my fullest endorsation. I am very glad that the minister has taken cognisant of the possible benefits to be derived from such a step, and when that bill comes in it shall have my hearty support as the present bill has but in that this shipbuilding takes precedence over the necessity for a similar measure for the encouragement of the agricultural industry, I differ with him entirely. Moreover, Mr. Chairman, I am totally opposed to all forms of retroactive post factum legislation, in other words I am totally opposed to that which will permit the breaking of the law and the escape of the guilty by means of legislation passed subsequent to the crime itself; it is a dangerous precedent and bad legislation.

However much in accordance with the hon. minister I might be on the question of bounty because of the encouragement it must give to those engaged in local industries, and God knows we stand in sore need of the improvement that such encouragement would bring about, I cannot agree to make this bounty retroactive in 1917, I know not how many dollars may be involved. If the amount were but fifty cents I should still object, not to the amount, Mr. Chairman, but to the principle of the thing. It is utterly wrong that a man should be given the benefit of that to which he can lay no claim and this House would be lacking in its duty were it to tolerate such legislation.

I had hoped, sir, that this bill was a bill whose sole object was to give encouragement to shipbuilding in the future and as such it would be deserving of the support of every member of this House, but in my opinion at least, post factum or retroactive legislation is rotten and wrong, and I submit sir, that we ought not to support anything of the kind without having due regard to the consequences. There are many things, three of four of which I now have in mind, where to make such a bill retroactive would not be only wrong but disastrous; nevertheless if we do that in the present case what would be the argument against doing it in others.

With regard to shipbuilding, tonnage and the like I am a mere child, but still I would give this bill my hearty support were it not for this unfortunate clause; that I cannot support.

I am sorry sir, for delaying the House so long, but before resuming my seat I again want to draw the attention of the House to the absolute lack of legislation to encourage the clearing of land, and I hope that the government will lose no time in making it commensurate with the beneficial results that would accrue to the country from such encouragement. When that bounty was granted the amount was fixed at $20, as I have already stated, and I leave it to honorable members to judge the value of $20 today as compared with ten years ago.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Chairman after listening to the very lengthy and eloquent criticisms of this bill, I do not think that it is necessary for me to refer to it at great length, but as the measure is one of perculiar importance in some of its aspects, I would refer briefly to the points I have in mind, but before doing so I may say that I am in thorough accorded with the general construction of the bill.

Shipbuilding tho small is nevertheless an important industry in this country. The district I have the honor to represent has for a number of years been largely engaged in the building of vessels for the foreign trade, and I wish to say right here that no better class of vessels, either in point of model or wonthiness can be found than those turned out from the dockyards of Placentia and St. Mary's. When I first saw this bill I scanned it in the hope of find-

ing therein some provision for the elimination of an unfortunate thing that has thus far been allowed to exist. I saw no section devoted to this and I consulted the Minister of Marine and Fisheries since he came into the House and he told me that a bill would be introduced at a later date embracing that matter. Now, Mr. Chairman; I do not see the necessity for another bill as it could have been dealt with in this one. All that would be necessary would be a clause in this bill whereby any vessel not able to pass Schedule A or B should not be allowed to engage in the foreign trade. I would go even further than that and prohibit such vessels from engaging in the coastwise trade. A bill should have been on our statute book long ago forbidding ships classed as floating coffins by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries himself going to sea, and I don't think there is any necessity now to longer defer the matter; we should do it right here by the insertion of the clause I have mentioned, and if such a clause were the means of saving even a single life it would be well worthy of the attention given it by this House. I have heard Sir John Crosbie say that he knew of a number of vessels having being sent across from here that were not fit to send outside of the narrows, and I feel sure that he has as much if not more knowledge and experience in shipping than any member of this House.

I hope the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will censider this matter and have this clause inserted. Increased encouragement should be given to builders of smaller crafts of the type of the "western Boat." The large ships are generally built by the large firms who have the financial backing and are not in need of the bounty. The smaller boats are built by fishermen who are entirely dependant upon them for a living. The people of Placentia and St. Mary's use only these boats for fishing purposes. When this bounty was given all material was at a very lew figure, but since then enormous increases have been made in the cost of material. We should insert a clause whereby increased encouragement should be given to planters for the building of these small vessels. A great number used to go down on the French Shore from Trinity Bay and Bonavista Bay to prosecute the fishery and members of these districts should use their influence to have this crause inserted. With bounties generally I am thoroughly in accord, and 1 want to endorse the remarks of the hon. member for St. George's in this connection. In the adoption of this bill a serious blow would have been struck against the high cost of living. Any legislation which would lessen the cost of the articles that are necessary on the poor man's table should have the support of every member of the House, and I believe that such a spirit prevails among them. If you can encourage the farmers to increase their crop of vegetables by granting a bounty you will make it easier for them to produce a meal for his family. Conditions today are almost at a breaking point when you must pay 40 cents a gallon for potaces, and I doubt if you can get them at that price. We can never hope to become a great farming country, but we can induce planters to go out into the bogs, and with the assistance of the government convert boglands and forests into farms that would be sufficiently productive to grow sufficient vegetables for local consumption. We should put upon the statute book a law that would provide a bounty for the clearing of land. I want to show this House that I care

not who is the introducer of this bill but I want to say that I am prepared to give that measure my unqualified support. I feel it my duty as one of the representatives of this House of Assembly to make reference to the absence of a section I would like to see embidied and I trust the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will see his way clear to insert two clauses I have referred to. If he will I will give every section of his bill my unqualified support.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES:—I may say that the bill drafted for the inspection of vessels provides for the inspection of all vessels by an agent of Lloyds or a deputy agent. Some of the clauses inserted have been copied from the Board of Trade bill, and anything you may not find in this bill will be found in the other. Referring to the duty rebate clause I may say that these duties can be paid now by order of Governor in Council. Mr. LeMessurier has stated that many builders have applied for a rebate of duty who were not entitled to it on account of not having been given a bounty. They used all the material they imported on these vessels and have said that they didn't know but they were entitled to a rebate.

Since the bounty act came into force 45 vessels have been paid a bounty amounting in all to $46,000. All vessels built were not paid a bounty. The 130 ton vessel built by the A.N.D. Co. was paid because she had her keel laid down before the act came into force.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—(Reads last section of bill to encourage shipbuilding). I do not think the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries touched on that point all together. With reference to this point I think when the war was on during 1916, there seemed as if there would be a big industry in shipbuilding and consequently Newfoundland would have to pay enormous bounties, so the government decided to name the bounty and the limit was up to schooners of about one hundred and twenty tons. Now a schooner of two or three hundred tons was recognized to be a rich man's schooner, owned by a man with lots of means, so one hundred and twenty tons was the limit set as it filled the requirements of the Labrador fishermen and the Grand Bank people and the other requirements around the island. That was the principle reason for limiting the bounty to one hundred and twenty ton schooners or may be one hundred and sixty tons, somewhere around there. The vessels of two and fifty or three hundred tons were used for different trades, some for carrying fish and other for freight purposes and enormous freights were paid during those days. One or two trips at the most paid for the cost of construction. There was no necessity to pay these owners and the hon. gentleman will I think appreciate the position. The bounty was for the fishermen and not for the merchants who were making fortunes out of the war in the freight business. That was our duty and I am prepared to support the bill before the House, but I am not prepared to support the position of going back three years and paying the amount on vessels of three hundred tons as during the war, as I stated they earned enormous freights and there is no hardship whatever. I do not intend to support the principle of having the act retroactive. I will if this part is withdrawn or a list of the parties to whom it may be payable is brought before us.

HON. MR. FOOTE:—Mr. Chairman, I submit that sub-section 2 of section 2 of the Shipbuilding Act should stand. The principle of repayment of duties paid for timber, anchors, chains, duck, blocks and such like material used in the construction of vessels is a good one, in that it encourages local ship-

building. By not granting a rebate of such duties you thereby give a preference to the Nova Scotia builders. The spirit of legislation all through has been to encourage local shipbuilding, not only by granting rebates on material used in their construction but to give bounties as well. No bounties are looked for in the claims at issue, but merely a repayment of duties made. I am informed and believe that the hon. leader of the opposition was approached during his term of office for a repayment of the duties in those cases now before the house and that the hon. leader of the opposition promised to make such repayment on production of particulars of the claims.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—In answer to the objection made by the hon. member for Burin with reference to the turning down of the Nova Scotian vessels, I may say that they are not fit for Newfoundland's requirements, and if they were not allowed to come in how many of them would be lost outside. What would happen if you sent them across the Atlantic with a load? The keel is so light and the rest of the material that the vessel would not be able to stand the strain of the cargo. When they are not able to meet the demands here then why should they be taken into consideration. If these people built vessels to suit Newfoundland then I would ask for it. As for my promise to see that the rebates were paid I think that was in reference to those vessels whose keels were laid previous to 1917. They will get the bounty. But I think it is ridiculous to pay three years' duty to those who have made fortunes in that direction. Bring down the names of the persons who claim them. It was pointed out in the speech from the throne that the sum of sixty thousand dollars was to be devoted to the erection of working men's homes. In comparison to this amount fifteen thousand dollars is a large amount when interest is reckoned.

HON. MR. FOOTE:—I do not know about that. You promised to pay it. I think if the hon. leader will reflect he will admit that he did promise to grant such rebates.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Burin for stepping to the fore for good old Grand Bank in this matter of shipbuilding. I am in agreement with what has been said by Sir Michael Cashin. And it was the intention to discontinue the bounty to vessels from about one hundred and fifty tons upwards. That action was justified because one trip paid for the vessel. During the war matters took a very different change and the freights earned could not permit the government to pay bounty and duty as well. Now, with reference to the Nova Scotian vessels shipbuilding for the past few years has been very prosperous. There were a number of vessels bought in Nova Scotia which helped us to carry our products across the ocean and every one who bought vessels in Nova Scotia made money out of them. I will support the act but will not if the retroactive section is not withdrawn. Anyway, if there is anybody entitled to the fifteen thousand dollars and we know their names, then I may give it some consideration.

HON. MR. FOOTE:—The Act of 1917 which excluded vessels of over 120 tons from receiving the bounty and rebates used in their construction was introduced to save the government from heavy claims which was feared would come from the Harbor Grace Shipbuilding Co. This company—as it is well known—commenced building very large and many vessels to sell abroad. The law previous to 1917 contemplated the payment of bounties and rebates only to such vessels as were built in this Dominion for the fishing and foreign trade of this country and

not for an outside company which might come in—as the Harbor Grace Shipbuilding Co.—as the demands would be altogether too large and thereby defeat the object and spirit of the act to encourage shipbuilding for the trade only. I believe the hon. leader of the opposition agrees with me in this particular and for that reason I submit he should withdraw his objections to sub-section 2 of section 3 of the proposed legislation.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—I would like to ask the member for Burin if it is his idea that the people should be called upon to pay a bounty on a schooner that cost $80,000 and that paid for herself the first trip across. I know vessels that have paid 50, 70; 100, and as high as 200%. I know vessels that have paid for themselves in the first trip. I have no objection to the bill starting from this date, I want to encourage the bill, but I am opposed to its being retroactive.

MR. FOX:—I am in acccord with the bill, that is, with a bounty being paid. But the part to which I object is clause 3, sub-section 2. I am opposed to the principle in the same way that I am opposed to retroactive taxation, If you begin this thing you can go back fifty years and give all kinds of concessions. I am in favor of the bill beginning from this date. You cannot tell us what is in the head of a legislator when a law is put on the statute books. It is not a sound principle of political economy. You don't know where it is going to lead you. It is all very well to say that it will only involve eight or ten thousand dollars, but we have to take into consideration the principle involved. It is a vicious principle, and because of that principle I disagree with the bill. Apart from that I do not object to it.

HON. MR. FOOTE:—The hon. member for St. John's East has elucidated the principle that there should be no application of the bill for the past, but to apply it to the future. If the bill is accepted it should be accepted all through. There are outstanding reasons for this condition in the past. I mentioned the Harbor Grace Shipbuilding Company. What would be the result if the government allowed this condition to continue? The Harbor Grace Shipbuilding Company would have swamped the government.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Chairman, I am absolutely opposed to the principle. The bill is intended to be retroactive. It is intended that the bill enable to be done what the statute books of the past three years says shall not be done. If we start out this thing where are we going to stand? If we allow the play of that principle, where are the affairs of this country going to end? The principle. Mr. Chairman, is a vicious one.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to indulge in any lengthy remarks on this question, but I would point out to the hon. minister, and I am sure he will see the point I am endeavouring to make, that this is not a case of discrimination, and I think that on reflection he will readily see the course that should be followed in dealing with the section now under consideration. We should view this question and frame the measure on broader lines or rather in a more practical way, for what is the point in allowing a clause of this kind to go thru? It amounts only to putting through legislation for the benefit of a few people. I do not altogether object to retroactive measures of this kind. If for instance, the people whom this section of the bill is calculated to benefit had suffered financial loss in the course of their operations of the past few years or if they needed help I should hesitate before offering any objection, but I think there is a vast difference between this class of man and those who will benefit under the act if sub-section 2 of sec-

tion 3 is allowed to remain. I am of opinion, and I think most honorable members will agree with me, that it would entirely meet the case if this legislation were to become effective as from to-day, and in that case any objection to the bill would be removed. It is altogether absurd for this House to pass legislation to refund money to people who don't want it, and apart from this the hon. minister will surely see that there is no difference of opinion between the two sides of the House on the bill. We on this side are in full agreement with the idea of encouraging shipbuilding, but it must be apparent that it would be an unnecessary gratuity and an unnecessary kindness for us to go down to the treasury and hand out money in this way that might be spent to better purpose. If we have eight or ten thousand dollars that we don't want we can doubtless find some more worthy purpose for it.

If these people could be shown to need the money it would be a different matter entirely, but apart from everything else a clause of this kind is not necessary. I do not know who these seven or eight people are who stand to benefit by this measure in its present form, but the enactment of legislation to pay back money to men who can buy out any member of this house, or at least most of us is, I think even the hon. minister himself will admit, going a bit too far. Those who get vessels from Nova Scotia during the past few years with only the advantage of free entry were able to compete with the builders of local vessels. It is not a question to be considered from the moral standpoint nor is it a question of moral justice because we are dealing with people who do not want the money, and I would like to draw the attention of the honourable minister for Burin to one point, namely, that it is no encouragement to pay bounties to those who built vessels during the past three or four years. These builders have made money during that period by reason of the unusual demand that existed for the vessels they were able to turn out, and that now when we have adverse conditions to contend with is the time that encouragement is most needed. I can quite conceive how the government at first blush would be guilty of this mistaken kindness, and by the clause in the bill we would surely be over doing kindness, or in plain words "rubbing grease to the fatted sow." I would predict that every one of these nine or ten men, I dont know who they are, are men of means, and I do not think they can say with truth that they need further encouragement than they have already got for the vessels built during the war period. I would support the placing of that eight or ten thousand dollars at the disposal of the smaller man, and on that ground I would suggest the withdrawal of this section.

HON. MR. FOOTE:—Mr. Chairman there is one point I would like to draw to the hon. member's attention, and I would first remark that I have a case in mind of one of those men to whom he referred as being able to buy up the members of this House, and who in reality is a very poor man, to whom this bounty would be of great assistance. Take the case of John Smith, who pays thirty thousand dollars for a vessel in Nova Scotia—his money goes out of the country and provides not a cent's worth of employment to local laborers or carpenters. On the other hand there is Tom Jones who builds a vessel here at a cost also of thirty thousand dollars, but out of this amount there is sure to be seventeen or eighteen thousand dollars paid out of this to the people of the country for labor, wood cutting and other things.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Mr. Chairman, like the other members who have got down to clause 2 sub section 3, I think retroactive legislation would bring bad results, because then we could make retroactive legislation to apply to any case when necessary. Take the case of Mr. Woodford. If he is convicted and dismissed from office, why not have retroactive legislation and bring him back to office. This is legislation for a class. Only 7 or 8 will be affected by it. Why should the majority have to dig down in their pockets to pay a duty on these ships. Mr. Foote says that one of these men is a poor man. Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not think any poor man could build a big ship, we must take that now with a grain of salt. There are other opportunities now to use this money so that it will help the masses as well as the classes. I hope legislation will be able to give the western boat an increase of 50% bounty, that is from 50 tons to 100 tons.

Before sitting down I wish to congratulate Mr. Foote for the pugnacious way in which he has grappled with this matter. I hope that when the H.C.L. matter comes up for discussion he will take the same pugracious stand to keep down the prices.

MR. MacDONNELL:—I wish to move an amendment. I move that sub-section 2 of section 3 be removed from the bill. It has been proved that this is of no benefit to the people. It has been stated and stated on good authority that the men who build ships in the past few years were paid a hundred fold. I fail to see why the House should go back and enact legislation for those who do not need it, and I submit that sub-section 2 of section 3 be removed from the bill.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to you that such an amendment is quite out of order. We should not discuss sub-section 2 of section 3 before we get to it. It is out of order for this reason, because it proposes to be an amendment that will be substantial when arrived at. Now there can be no amendment to that motion that it do not pass. If desirous of a vote take section 1 first and later the other sections.

MR. MacDONNELL:—I willingly and knowingly submitted that amendment because I wanted to assist legislature, but I will withdraw the amendment until the section is reached.

The chairman from the committee also reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

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

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 172 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Survey of Foreign-Going Vessels"

Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave notice that he would on tomorow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 11 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Department of Marine and Fisheries."

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled balance sheets of income and expenditure account of the Grenfell Association.

It was moved and seconded that when the house rises it adjourn until

three of the clock tomorrow afternoon.

MR MOORE:—Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the motion for an adjournment of the house permit me to ask the acting Minister of Shipping if he has any explanation to make with regard to the state the city is in to-day in connection with the coal question.

I may inform the House that I went this morning from one end of the city to the other, and with money in my pocket, to buy a quarter of a ton of coal, but there was none to be had. Would the hon. acting minister kindly inform us when he expects to have any. I do not altogether blame the minister for the scarcity, as I believe he has the best intentions; but he probably is like myself and knows very little about shipping, and would not be able to tell a sailing vessel from a steamer if we saw them going up or down the harbor, except there was a funnel in one of them to enable us to make the distinction.

The coal situation has reached a very serious stage in the city at present, as apparently there is not a knob to be had, as far as buying it is concerned. I rang up by telephone the Minister's office this morning, but could not get it. Next I communicated with the Government Engineer and got an indefinite answer. I then endeavoured to get in touch with the Reid Nfld. Co., but again without success. Several other coal firms and places were called on by me, but the result of all my enquiries was that there was not a lump of coal available.

I would especially like for the Minister to inform us of what the actual position is concerning the coal problem.

HON. MINISTER OF SHIPPING: —Mr. Speaker, at present there are four vessels gone to load coal. Two of them are now on their way here from Sydney with cargoes and I hope to have them here by the end of this week. If the hon. member for Ferryland is badly in need of coal, I think I can arrange to give him enough to put him over a few days. In fact I hope to have the four cargoes referred to here by Sunday next.

MR. BENNETT:—Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a word to say in this respect. The hon. minister is aware that this morning I made application to him for a small quantity of coal, but could not get any either for my factory or my dwelling house. I would like to know if there is not coal, which was very recently brought and landed in St. John's, held up here by certain parties. I understand that the steamers Prospero and Meigle brought cargoes. I presume the latter ship brought it to the Reid Newfoundland Company; but if not it should be put to the use of citizens.

HON. MINISTER OF SHIPPING: —I do not know of any coal being held up. I know that Bown had some for sale, but he was experiencing some difficulty in the matter of cartage.

MR .BENNETT:—Bown told me he did not have an ounce to spare.

HON. MINISTER OF SHIPPING : —I think we can arrange to supply exceptional cases right away. I arranged with Bown this morning in that direction. The S.S. Coban came here a few days ago with a cargo of coal for the Reid Company, as it was absolutely necessary for them to run their trains, as I understand that this section of the country is absolutely without coal for the carrying on of traffic However, I think that there is a possibility of relieving pressing or urgent cases in town at the present time. We are hoping to have four steamers here by the end of this week and when they arrive the whole situation ought be relieved for a while.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, May 5th, 1920.

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

THE PRIME MINISTER:—In reference to the question of Sir Michael Cashin answered yesterday relating to the cost of the railway branch line construction from Catalina railway station to Port Union terminus, and Sir Michael's request for further information. I am informed by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines that the amount paid in connection with the right of way was $12,736. That sum is in addition to the amount paid the Reid Nfld. Co. for construction purposes.

HON. MINISTER OF EDUCATION:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition which is signed by Samuel Bradbury, Geo. Hierlihy and 83 others asking that a flag station be erected at Country Road, District of Hr. Grace. Occasionally a train stops there to put off a gentleman coming from town, and I support this petition which asks that the train be stopped there whenever necessary for the convenience of everybody in that sector.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Speaker, at your request, and as you are unable to present a petition, being the Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition on behalf of Rev. Fr. Dinn and 166 others of Carbonear, asking that a sum of money sufficient to make possible the laying of a four inch pipe to connect the Carbonear water system with the R. C. church at that place.

In presenting this petition from practically the whole Catholic denomination of this important town of Carbonear I am informed by you that the respected clergyman of this denomination, Monsignor McCarthy and the sisters of the Convent have suffered in the extreme the past three years through lack of water for drinking purposes and household use. Quite a number of years since a small lead pipe from the water company's line was brought to the Monsignor's residence and for some years afforded a supply of water for drinking purposes but through the condition of the water company's service and a break in the lead pipe which the company failed to make good, the greatest inconvenience has been experienced. I also understood from you that some pipes are now in the city which were brought in for this extension, and I have to express your hope that the Government will see its way clear to accede to the prayer of this petition and I therefore ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

The Hon. Prime Miniser replies to questions.

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries replies to questions.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the bill entitled An Act to amend Chapter 172 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series), entitled "Of the survey of Foreign-going and Labrador vessels," was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted of Marine and Fisheries, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 11 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series), entitled "Of the Department of Marine and Fisheries," was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant or order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries ,the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider the bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 176 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third

Series) entitled "Of the Encouragement of Shipbuilding."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Committee of the whole on bill "An Act respecting the Encouragement of Shipbuilding."

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—Mr. Chairman, with regard to this sub-section 2 of section 3, I wish to make one or two alterations, I propose to withdraw the following words:

"Where any vessel of a greater tonnage than one hundred and twenty tons, the keel of which was laid after October 19th, 1917, and before the passing of this act, has been built."

The amended clause will therefore read "Where any vessel built and launched in Newfoundland during the year 1919," the figures "120 tons" should read "130 tons." The remaining part of the clause reads as before, ed, and on motion of Hon. the Minister viz.: "and duty has been paid upon the materials used in the construction of the said vessel, the owner of such vessel shall be entitled to be repaid the amount of such duty upon proof to the satisfaction of the customs authorities that such duty has been paid: provided always that the surveyor or his deputy shall certify that the said vessel has been built in accordance with schedule A. or B. of the said chapter."

That means that only vessels launched in 1919 can get this rebate. In fact there are no claims at the customs from any vessels other than those. The claims so far made to the government are as follows:

The Marystown Trading Company, Harris, Ltd., G. Buffett, D. Pelley and another applicant not named. The Union Shipbuilding Company has also a claim for rebate on the schr. "President Coaker" of about $900, that claim does not appear on the list as it has not been filed at the customs house. The total amount claimed as rebate on such vessels as are included in this clause is $7000.

The total is $7,029.09. So far as we know those are all the claims from vessels launched during 1919, and in order to make sure that those vessels are entitled to rebate, under this act, they must pass inspection under schedule B. Many new vessels or vessels launched up to 1919 did not come in for this rebate because they came in under the bounty act of 1916 before we decided that vessels of certain tonnage were to be cut off from receiving the rebate. When the government decided to alter the 1916 act, it gave notice in the papers two or three months ahead, consequently many keels were then laid down in anticipation in order to secure the bounty.

I notice in the statement asked for by the hon. leader of the opposition which I tabled to-day, that 80 schooners received the bounty in the years 1917-18 and '19 of which 30 were foreign built vessels, and on which was paid $130,000 bounty. The other fifty were local fishing schooners, and of course received the bounty. Those claiming the rebate built vessels in good faith, knowing they were debarred from bounty, but believing they would receive the rebate, and they built good vessels which could qualify under schedule B. of the shipbuilding act. I am perfectly satisfied that they are entitled to the rebate, and as I did not feel like plowing in the old furrow and asking the Governor-in-Council to repay the rebate by minute of council, but considered it proper to apply to this House for this authority, I feel sure the House will recognize the legitimate claim of those builders and place them in the same position as regards rebate of duties as their more fortunate competitors who not only re-

ceived the rebate, but also the bounty.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Mr. Chairman. Notwithstanding the amendments that the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries proposes to make, there is nothing in that amendment which would alter the decision which I came to yesterday in connection with sub-section 2 of section 3 of this bill. It's simply the same thing put before this House in another form, because the section stated before:

"Where any vessel of a greater tonnage than 120 tons, the keel of which was laid after October 19th, 1917, and before the passing of this act, has been built in this colony, and duty has been paid upon the materials used in the construction of said vessels shall be entitled to be paid the amount of such duty upon proof to the satisfaction of the proper customs authorities that such duty has been paid; provided always that the surveyor or his deputy shall certify that said vessel has been built in accordance with schedule A. or B. of the said chapter."

Well, Sir, the amendment and alteration which the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has proposed to bring forward covers exactly the same ground. There is no doing away with the fact that the legislation he proposes to introduce in retroactive, and that I have already contended, is a bad policy; it is a vicious policy, and I say, Sir, that we should not establish a precedent of this kind in this legislature, because if we do, it may have far-reaching results. Powerful interests in this country in years to come, may make similar demands upon the revenue, and without particularizing what these demands may be, beyond saying that they may be unjust or dishonest, if sufficient influence can be brought to bear upon the department to which that claim may be referred, the head of that department may ask legislature to have it accepted and the legislature may adopt the suggestions made. I say, Sir, by this means we are laying ourselves open to unscrupulous parties, who may, for some reasons of their own, dissipate the whole revenue of the Colony.

It strikes me as peculiar that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries should ask this House and should ask the authority of this legislature to grant a rebate and to hand over to capitalists, a rebate of duty on material used in the construction of vessels built three years ago and to pay this money out of the revenue of this country. It seems to me unjust and unreasonable that the people of this country should be asked to hand out $7,029.09 to four or five parties, it might be said after all, the amount involved is only small. It is not the amount we look at; it is the precedent established, it is the principle involved; and if we allow this legislation to go through endless trouble may come of it in after years.

Satisfactory statements have been made here in this House by members during this debate, that there was no goodreason as to why this retroactive legislation should be accepted. Statements have been made that immense profits were made all through the war in connection with the shipping business. Inferences have been made that vessels that cost $70,000 paid for themselves in one trip alone and that dividends from 40 per cent. to 100 per cent. were drawn. When we take these facts into consideration are we justified or have we any good reason to introduce retroactive legislation and give out of the public revenue over $7000 to people who have already made large dividends in the shipping industry. The people and the firms who are claiming this rebate from the Government have amongst them the Marystown Trading Company. This company, we are in-

formed, has made handsome dividends on all their vessels engaged in the foreign trade. Another firm asking for this rebate is Buffett & Company. They are looking for the modest sum of $1796. Why should the people of the country be asked to contribute that amount out of the general revenue? The people who are now putting forward their claims for the rebate must have known that according to the Shipbuilding Act they were not entitled to the rebate.

Another claimant for this rebate is the firm of S. Harris, Ltd., for the amount of $1391.00. Now, Sir, we can quite easily understand why my hon. friend, the member for Burin, came in here yesterday, and speaking on this bill with that pugnacious spirit insisting that this bill should go through. The principals are his constituents. Mr. Foote was dramatically trying to appeal to the House to have this bill become law. If the people claiming this rebate were poor men with no visible means of backing, then the hon. member for Burin would have my sympathy, but under the circumstances I cannot give the bill before the chair my support. There is no reason why we should hand out to the Marystown Trading Co. $1650.00. There is no reason why the people of this country, the laborers of this country who have been made sweat by the profiteers, hand out their money, because it is the money of the people generally. There is no reason why the Marystown Trading Company, Buffett & Co., and S. Harris Ltd. should be handed out this money. I admit that those people contribute to the general revenue of the country but then they are only falling in line with the rest of us. With reference to D. Pelley, well, I do not know to what category he belongs, presumably a contractor, probably he builds ships for the merchants. The F.P.U. are down for $900.00. The F.P.U. is in a good financial position and it can do without the $900.00. There are lots of use to which that money can be put to better advantage. I think it would be a greater tribute to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries and it would give him greater backing if he introduced a bill that was for the masses and not for the classes as this bill stands for. I appeal now to the common sense and saner judgment of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to his strong conception of honest legislation and his desire to safeguard the public interests, in his pronounced policy of the greatest good to the greatest number.

What the object is of introducing this bill I am at a loss to understand. Is it to compensate friends for their political support and influence in the recent election? The late government has been accused of every crime on the political calendar, but in my opinion no government since the introduction of responsible government, ever before attempted to railroad through this House legislation of such an indecent character as that now being debated. It is not my intention to speak any longer or at any great length on this matter, but I wish to say that I am in perfect accord with the statements made on this side of the House yesterday, while this Bill was in the Committee Stage. With reference to bounties we see no provision for an agriculture bonus or bounty. That bonus for which the people all over the country are calling out for. We see no assistance given the farmers to carry on their farming and it is absolutely necessary to encourage agriculture if we hope to reduce the high cost of living. Look at the conditions existing in this city to-day and one feels ashamed. Potatoes are twelve dollars per barrel and one is lucky to get them at

that price. The price of hay and all kinds of vegetables are exorbitant. I think the least the government can do is bring in some measure to encourage the cultivation of our lands and this would no doubt tend to help reduce the high cost of living. The high cost of living was mentioned in the manifesto of the Prime Minister last October, but sir, it is conspicuous by its absence in the speech from the throne. I ask in all sincerity that the Governmen enquire into the conditions existing among the people of this country. Look at the prices of food and clothing and coal and other things. And when this is done you will see what the people are up against.

Never before were conditions in this country in such a disgraceful and discreditable condition as they are at the presnt moment. Here we have had a government in power seven months, and what have they done? Nothing. Never when the opposition held the Government of the day was there one occasion when things were as they are at the present, and that under war conditions. Go down on Water Street and one cannot buy or a lump of coal to burn. Flour is $20.00 per barrel, sugar is 23c. per lb., and so on. Is it any wonder the people all over the country are asking that something be done to reduce the high cost of living?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member for Placentia, Mr. Sullivan, is not speaking in accordance with the rules of the House. He is discussing the high cost of living and not the bill before the chair.

MR. SULLIVAN:—I am coming to the bounty question and all that I have said is relevant t othe bill before the chair. I am covering the whole ground. Apparently I have touched the Minister of Justice on a sore subject, and he cannot stand the home truths ne is getting from this side of the House. If he is the good sport I knew him to be he will take his medicine like a man. Before we are through with this session we are going to try and convince the House and the people that we are not as bad as we are painted, we are not the grafters we are charged with being, and even granting that the crowd on this side of the House are as bad as they are painted, I would ask the people whether they would not prefer to live under the conditions that existed when the opposition were the government or under the conditions under which they are living today.

Sir, we can provide money for the building of ships, we can provide money by means retroactive legislation to compensate a certain class of people for rebates, but there is no provision and no intimation of any provision being made for the poor old age pensioners. I see no provision, no bounty for the old age pensioners or for the oldwomen of the country. In the manifesto of the Prime Minister reference was made to a policy of old age pensions not only for every deserving old man but for every old woman too. These were only catch cries during the campaign previous to the general election. But as soon as the general election is over just as soon as the promises forgotten. I would ask, Sir, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who introduced this bill to withdraw the amendment. That section referring to retroactive payments, during the debate of this bill the Minister of Marine and Fisheries said he would withdraw the paragraphs and I hope he is going to stick to his word, because I am sure if he carries through this legislation which he proposes to be is only tying a millstone round his neck that will cause him trouble at a later date, and he is not

strengthening his position politically by bringing in this bill and railroading it through the House, an act that will give rebates to political followers. I have great respect for the hon. minister and I am sure he will do what is fair to the country and not bring in legislation that will promote the interests of the wealthy only. I have finished, Sir, and will not support the bill as it is proposed to be placed on the statute books by the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:— Sir, I am glad the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sullivan) has finished his long speech. It took me quite a few minutes to discover his topic on which he was speaking, he must have had several bills before him and taken the wrong one. Of course it is not unusual during the debate for some members to take up the wrong bill and stick to it for a considerable length of time. Of all the various matters on which the honourable gentleman touched there are two which call for a reply. I submit that first of all the quotation of special names as coming in for the benefit of this legislation is no reason why the act should be rejected. The mere fact that these people come in for the advantage of the act is not a valid reason for objecting to it. It does not make any difference whether certain companies come in for the advantage of the act, such as the Marystown Trading Co., and S. Harris, Ltd., and others, and they have more of the world's goods than we. Why should this kind of thing interfere with the principle of the bill? If this would hold then the Government in future in dealing with rebates would be guided according to the wealth of the party entitled or may be looking for it. If they have enough material wealth then they would not be entitled to the rebate and that is absolutely absurd. It would revolutionise the principle of the whole affair. I do not see why these people should be prevented from getting back the amount of duty they paid when they laid the keels of the vessels and they are entitled to the rebate and there is a difference between vessels built here and ones bought in a foreign country. Now with reference to the high cost of living referred to by the hon. member for Placentia (Mr. Sullivan). The price of flour and all the other commodities has not increased ten per cent. during the last seven months when compared with the increase for the past twenty-four months. The hon. member can make whatever excuses he likes, it might have been war or the after-affects of war that kept the prices up, but the fact remains that the talk about the high cost of living amounts to this, that of the increases during the last twenty-four months not ten per cent of them can be accounted for during the seven months the government is in power.

I don't see what a man's wealth has to do with whether or not he will get the duty back. For example, the A.N.D. Co. were trying to get a rebate. I don't just remember now what the articles were. The fact that they are wealthy is no reason why they should not get it. We don't discuss the financial standing of those who should get it or who should not get it.

The article in which the A.N.D. Co. was interested was, I think, sulphur. They imported a lot of it and had no use for it. If they could export it within a reasonable time they would get the duty back. Owing to the lack of tonnage they could not do that. We did not discuss if A.N.D. Co. was wealthy company. We thought they were entitled to the rebate and we refunded it. The only think we discussed was the principle. It is no argument. The government could have paid back this money without bringing the matter before the House. The hon. member for

St. John's East, Mr. Fox, argues that it would be retroactive and repealing a law already existing. Every day that we are in this House we are repealing, altering and amending laws of the country, which are already existing.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Chairman, this bill now before the House, at least to my mind, affects every symptom of the country's trade. I welcome the criticism that has been introduced by the hon. member for Fortune Bay in replying to the very able criticism by my able colleague, Mr. Sullivan. There is no question that the bill now before the House does not deserve the support or sympathy of the hon. members of this House. Every clause and every phase of the bill must be seriously considered. My colleagues who have already spoken from this side of the House have voiced my sentiments. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that it does not deal with the aspects that I think it should deal with. We are called on by this third section to give the sum of $15,000 to a few people who are engaged in the occupation of shipbuilding. Included amongst these ladies or gentlemen some of my constituents or some other gentlemen's constituents may figure. I care not, Mr. Chairman, whether these people are my constituents or some other gentlemen's constituents. I claim that if the statement made in this House two or three evenings ago was correct, and I want to refer to that statement by Sir John Crosbie in the course of his remarks respecting the general condition of shipping during the period of the war and after. He (Sir John) said that the initial cost of $80,000 was paid back to him in the first voyage. I say, Mr. Chairman, that each and every member of this House is a party to the corrupt activity which has been going on—the worst in the history of responsible government in Newfoundland. If Sir John, I say, is prepared to substantiate the statement that he made in this House a few evenings ago, then I think it is the duty of every member of this House to oppose this bill.

I do not believe that my honorable friend, the Minister of Public Works, for instance, wants to go back to his constituents in his district of Twillingate and try and justify that he was compelled in accordance with this assembly to support and give his sanction to a measure that meant the direct handing out of over fifteen thousand dollars of the people's money to a party of capitalists. I have the same regard and the same respect and the same confidence in the integrity of the Minister of Public Works that I have always had; and I have the same for the greater number of the members of this assembly—that in this matter before the House this afternoon, whether it is to catch votes or compensate for votes captured during the political campaign, I hope and trust that all the gentlemen of this House it will be dealt with by this tribunal of men properly constituted in an impartial manner ,and the matter with which I am now dealing is one of great importance and about which every member of this House ought to be concerned, and it is the Act Cap. 107, Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland, 3rd series, entitled "Of the Encourage of Shipbuilding." The building of ships, the sailing of ships and ships' management are three essentials in the life of Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders. But it is not going to be easy for any particular member or particular section of this House to come in here and introduce a bill which appertains only to a particular section of people. I notice that the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance are amusing themselves in regard to some subject which I do not know, and I would like them to inform the House what is the particular mat-

ter over which they are having a laugh.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—For the information of the hon. member for Placentia (Mr. Walsh) I may say that the Prime Minister was asking me if I would go with him to supper at St. Mary's church at six o'clock.

MR. WALS:H—I am sure the hon. the Minister of Finance is delighted to have extended to him the invitation by the Prime Minister to attend the party and he will be able to tell us all about it in due course. I know he shall be glad to participate in all suppers in his honor, and I feel sure he will keep a sufficient storage capacity open to partake of the good things that will be accorded him on this particular occasion. I thank the Hon. Minister of Finance for the information. Now with regard to the subject about which I was talking, it is of far more significance, of far more importance, and more reason in it; and it concerns each and every individual of this House more than the suppers tendered the Hon. Minister of Finance. Of course I appreciate his desire to try and take part in all the suppers that are given in his honor, but let us go back to the subject and let the best efforts of each member of this House be focussed absolutely on the objective of bringing around better conditions in this country. I will, as did the hon. member for St. George's yesterday, take this opportunity of placing myself on record with regard to the advocacy of an increased bounty for agricultural efforts. Now, without intentionally interfering or holding up of the affairs of this assembly, I want to say that this matter would be a bonanza to the country if properly handled . Go ahead and let the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or the Prime Minister in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines introduce a measure and make an honest attempt to uplift his fellow man and the extension of agriculture along legitimate lines and relieve some of the many hardships existing. To that I will give my unqualified support. I for a short period held the important position of Minister of Agriculture and Mines and no man can justify the charges that have been made against me. Under the regime of W. J. Walsh the Department of Agriculture and Mines had no opportunity to make any recommendations. This department in the future history of the country will prove to be a prominent factor. And here we have a bill for the further development and extension of the building of ships.

Mr. Chairman, this bill that we are now discussing is calculated to have a very marked effect on the whole prosperity of the country and while, as I stated at our last sitting, some sections of this bill have my entire support, this section that has been so vigorously, so ably and so wisely opposed by my colleagues on this side of the House must not be allowed to go unchallenged and to the opposition already offered to its passage I now subscribe my quota. I, for the life of me, cannot understand why this House should vote fifteen thousand dollars or fifteen thousand cents just for the purpose of satisfying the request of any particular section of the community for the sake of party politics, and, Mr. Chairman, I want to place myself on record as a representative of one of the most important districts in the country, whether it be in shipbuilding or ship sailing, fish catching or fish marketing as being opposed to it. It is my pleasure, my honor and my duty to voice the opposition of that district which is the embodyment of all those qualifications I have named, to this iniquious measure. It is quite true, sir, that many of those ships which were destined to play a prominent part during the war in the transportation of our produce, were cradled in different parts of my district during the years inclusive in

this bill and would therefore come within its provisions for a share of this $15,000 which is to be handed back to the builders by our liberal financiers; but, sir, I care not if I offend some of my best friends, nay, I care not if I offend all my best friends. I only realize my bounden duty to the country at large. I onl yrealize that circumstances compel me to give my absolute and unqualified opposition to a bill which has for its intention the paying back of monies to persons who will take advantage of the position that may thus be created for making further in-

Chairman, it was stated by honorable members in this House, and reasons were given, that no such returns roads on the country's funds. Mr. should be made. In this connection I would remind the House of the speech made by the hon. member for Port de Grave, Sir John Crosbie, whose words on that occasion I distinctly remember. I am first of all, sir, a Newfoundlander, and a son of the sod, and anything that will benefit the masses, the sons of toil, will receive my hearty and unqualified support; but in this measure I see nothing of the principles I have enunciated, and I hope and trust that the father of this bill, the Honourable Minister of Marine and Fisheries, will see his way clear to take into consideration the helpful suggestions offered by the members on this side of the House, and I feel, sir, that the hon. minister is big enough to do this where he sees that such action on his part is likely to be attended by results beneficial to the interests of the common people. I say this in no spirit of flattery; the hon. minister and myself have agreed to disagree on certain principles and we shall continue to disagree, but I want to say, not only to those now in this House, but to the whole country, thru the reporters' box, that whenever any measure is brought into this House worthy of the consideration of the hon. members of this or worthy of the consideration of the men who in turn are worthy to represent the outport constituencies of this country and having for its object the betterment of the general condition in this country, it shall have my ungruding support.

But, and these buts seem to cause all or nearly all of the rows that have occurred in parliamentary proceedings, not only in this country but in every country. The bill that we are now discussing, Mr. Chairman, is one of the bills that must have a very great interest to the people of this country and to each and every member of this ouHse, whether a representative of St. John's or an outport district. With some sections of this bill I am in perfect accord but with other sections I am absolutely opposed to. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, do you think that it is justice to your constituents to grant an additional bounty to men who have already realized 100% on these vessels. Each and every member of this House and each and every individual of this island shall have the details of this action, and I shall place my language in such a way that will make the position clear to them. I would ask you, Mr. Chairman, to revert your mind back a few hours ago when the seat you now filled was occupied by the hon. member for St. Barbe, Mr. Scammell, to a statement made by Sir John Crosbie. I want to focuss your attention and the attention of the Prime Minister to that statement. Sir John said in criticising this bill that an amount of money would be provided that some honored persons would receive $15,000. Sir John stated that during the war vessels costing $80,000 were sent across the Atlantic, and on their first voyage these vessels produced enough money to pay the investors a handsome return on the moneys they invested. Now, Mr. Chairman, I consider that this is a most remarkable statement.

I regret that the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries sees his way clear to leave the House at this particular time because I am now coming to a stage in my remarks that will need his attention and the attention of the House. After all the money these shipbiulders have made these men have the gall to come in here this afternoon and ask the government to give them a further play upon the revenue of this colony. I think each and every member of this House will agree with me that this is a request which should be relegated to the happy hunting grounds from which no traveller returns. I never want to see a repetition of this request. If you want to maintain the respect and confidence that was placed in you months ago it is not right that you should give your sympathy and tolerance to the passage of such a bill for the privilege of these people. If you are to measure up to the platform that was enunciated by you as being the Liberal Reform Party, I say, Mr. Chairman, it is your bounden duty to relegate to the back fyles any legislation of this kind. I absolutely agree to some of the sections in this bill, the absolutely may also be added to show any condemnation of the other parts of the bill. I think it would be a calamity to allow such a bill to pass through this chamber without a thorough ventilation. Too long we have lived in a fool's paradise, so to speak, in regard to this measure. It was a matter of whether Mr. Coaker was a friend of mine or whether Mr. So and So was a friend of mine. We have now come to a stage when questions of this kind shall no longer exist.

Questions that bring untold poverty to our people. These are the questions that we must consider and consider very carefully. Too long, I submit, have the petty affairs of this Island been allowed to sway in the judgment of gentlemen who are sitting on either side of this chamber. And if we want to act as true, patriotic Newfoundlanders and redeem ourselves from the unfortunate state of affairs that we are now passing through. We should not allow a moment to pass. Personally I believe that the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has had some consideration for the country at large in regard to the recommendations he has made and which are embodied in this bill. With these recommendations and with these desires that have prompted the hon. member, I am entirely in accord. But I think it would be much better for the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he had some practical men with him in regard to the bill we are now discussing. I say if he had some practical men in his party whom he could consult with regard to this matter, perhaps the observations coming from this side of the House might be unnecessary.

I want to say that so far as I am concerned I honestly believe that the oHn. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is absolutely honest in his desires for a great number of the people in this country. But I want to place myself on record, and coupled with that statement that I have just openly made through the reporters' box, that I believe the hon. minister is laboring under a delusion, if he considers that the brains and the ability of this House is composed absolutely by the gentlemen who sit behind him in this assembly. In further discussing the bill, I would ask him to look behind himself and consider for a moment, without being personal, the gentlemen who are associated with him and who have been directly associated with him in this particular branch of our industries. I have very carefully glanced along and noticed the personnel of the gentlemen who sit opposite me this afternoon, and, I am open to conviction, I do not see one individual member holding his

seat who has had the silghtest, the remotest experience in relation to the particular bill that we are now considering this evening. But when I look around on this side, I can see men, three at least, who have had an intimate experience with regard to the industry that is outlined in the bill. Of course this is not a matter that the government would have to be very particular about; this is a matter that only affects the country at large; and obeying the country at large is not a matter that has up to the present moment entered the minds or brains of the present government; but I wish to assure you that the time is not far distant when your actions with regard to any legislation that you may enact in this House will have far-reaching effect upon the general electorate of this country.

As a Newfoundlander I am glad, and Ihope and pray and believe and trust that sectarianism will be relegated in the background and that you will be judged by your actions by the common people, irrespective of class or creed. Referring to this matter, if I am permitted, I want to say that had I went to the district of Placentia and St. Mary's last autumn under the banner of any man, whether he was Sir M. P. Cashin, Hon. Mr. Squires or the Hon. W. F. Coaker, or any other gentleman in this House or outside of it, I would have been elected; and I claim it as my right to state that the services of W. J. Walsh to the district of Placentia and St. Mary's for the four years that I had the honor to represent it fully justified the electors of that section of the Island to give me a further extension of their confidence and sent me back to this assembly. I make that statement and make it deliberately. There has been a lot said within the past few days with regard to the late contest. Now I want to place myself on record.

MR. CHAIRMAN:—Keep to the point.

MR. WALSH:—I am dealing with the matter before the chair. I want to say that when the time in this country arrives, and I hope it never will, when we as Newfoundlanders will be stifled or shut off from giving expression to the feelings that we have with regard to the general conduct of our public affairs, then I say that that day will be a lamentable one for our whole population.

I regret Mr. Chairman, that I have not the time to give to this very serious matter, as the whole composition of this House is affected by the clause in this bill which we have requested to have eliminated. I think that those gentlemen who comprise the overwhelming majority in this chamber should have given more consideration to this important measure. If they had considered its seriousness, they would give their unqualified support to the suggestions that have been conveyed from this side of the House.

With regard to my jurisdiction over the department of Agriculture and Mines I had not the opporunity to bring in the legislation that I know would be beneficial to ninety per cent. of the people of this dominion. With regard to the subject of bounty, I want to place myself on record as being in accord with the spirit of the bill, but I am opposed to that part of the bill which is intended to give back to certain wealthy gentlemen revenue which they have paid into the treasury of the country. The hon. gentleman, the member of Fogo, objects to my remarks. I say that any gentleman who has anything to say with regard to the expenditure of the country's revenue has a right to be heard. Lay before us whatever arrangement has been made between John Jones and Tim. Gibbons. Tell us what you want to do. I have no doubt

that you do not want to put through an act that you would not lay before the people.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the point that I am coming to is that you are attempting vicious legislation. I see that it is now 25 minutes to six. I want to speak at least three hours longer. But it is with no spirit of obstruction, with an absolutely honest desire. It will be beneficial to the people that we must thoroughly consider any and all legislation that comes before this House. I honestly feel that my hon. friend, the father if this bill, in spite of all that has been said about him, has honest intentions in placing this bill before the House. I want to go on record as being one of the men who represents the people's interests, and if you want to know what I represent I recommend you to the department that I held for some time. I recommend you to the official records of the Colonial Secretary's department. When you see the records of my conduct you will know that I am fully qualified to give my views on this very important matter.

I regret that I have had to detain the House to such length with regard to this matter, but I want to say this that bills of this nature cannot expect to pass this House without just criticism.

Now with regard to that clause as to the amount of money that should be paid back on ships built since 1917, I must completely oppose it. I do not believe that there is any desire on the part of the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to make any recommendation that any money be put through any particular channel for any particular purpose. I believe that the hon. father of the bill is big and honest enough to believe that it is in the interests of the people, but I want to say that this bill would do a great injustice to the masses of the people that are represented here. It is indeed to benefit the few. That clause which refers to the paying back of the money is vicious and should not be incorporated in the bill.

I do not believe it till I hear it from his own lips that the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries would be guilty of the charge of going against those principles he has enunciated time and again in his speeches and through this House, and I want to assure him that if in this matter he takes the part of the underdogs he will have no greater supporter than the gentleman who is now addressing the House. I assure him that I care not if my own brother or my own cousin is a claimant for a share of this $15,000. I care not if it was on the eve of the election in the district of Placentia and St. Mary's, I on behalf of the people who are called upon to pay their proper proportion, dime for dime, and cent for cent, record my unqualified and absolute opposition.

On reflection, Mr. Chairman, I really don't think that it is the serious intention of the government to force this legislation, for I believe that on the other side of the House are men who have at heart the interests of the people who sent them here. When you, Mr. Chairman, were returned for the old and historic district of Fogo, you were not sent back here to represent any particular faction of the people, but the whole country, and so it is with every hon. member of this House, and I would not for a moment insinuate that you would attempt to use your official position for the purpose of benefitting any particular class in the country.

We are not here to pass without question, legislation that is likely to be detrimental to the country; we are here to scrutinize and to offer suggestions that might be helpful, and accepting these fundamental principles I have laid down I have an honest desire to add to the worth of this bill by some suggestion or suggestions that would

make it work out more harmoniously, having regard to the beneficial results, and these are the feelings that prompt me to rise in my place in this House and add a word to the able, eloquent and reasonable criticism that has already been offered.

I am sure the hon. members of both sides of the House will give me their material support in the bill which improvement of them is going to be placed before the House. I regret the fact that provision was not made for the class of men who were equally deserving of the best consideration and efforts of each and every member of this House. I refer to the small man, the planter, and I don't know, Mr. Chairman, that down in your own district you can find men who have gone down to the French Shore to prosecute the fishery in craft smaller than 100 or 120 tons. I want to defy successful contradiction that I have myself engaged in the actual codfishery in the district of St. Barbe, and having done so it is only right, only just, and only reasonable that I should have some idea, however small, of the conditions that have prevailed on that coast. My reason for mentioning this particular is not that I have any desire of contesting this district, I am perfectly satisfied to contest the district of Placentia and St. Mary's, and judging from appearances I will continue to represent that district for some years yet.

It is quite true that this section only deals with half dozen or more people which we are called upon to-day to grant $15,000 for vessels built since 1917 and judging from the statement made by Hon. J. C. Crosbie that a vessel which cost $80,000 in construction paid for itself in one voyage it would be a disgrace and a downright injustice if we were to allow ourselves to pass such a bill. If this bill should pass it would only be right and fair of the people of the country were to come up in their masses and demand the keys of this assembly and say that you are no longer fit to represent us. These are my views, and in expressing them I believe I am expressing the views of all present. I don't claim anything in this connection. I don't believe the Prime Minister would bring in a bill to support legislation for a number of people who have made such a lot of money during the war. If these people were allowed to make enormous profits on the capital involved I must place on record my absolute condemnation of this clause.

Another section which is not included in the bill and one which I have raised an objection on account of its absence is the suggestion that the great mass of our people who are called upon to give such big money to the revenue should be considered.

I want to place myself on record as being one who is absolutely opposed to the adoption of the section of this bill that has been so openly criticized and objected to by members on this side of the House, and I want to suggest that this particular section be eliminated entirely, and I want to inform the House that I have a section which will confidently and more acceptably fill the place of the one to be discarded, if you will accept it. I want to assure you that if you will acept the amendment that I am about to suggest, that you will have done a great thing for the common interests of the common people. Men have gone; men have come. We are to-day a new assembly composed, I hope, of some gentlemen who represent some of the intelligent sections of our Island home. We are an assembly of Newfoundlanders and we all can claim that we are sons of the soil, and claiming to be such, is it not only honest and just and reasonable that we should come into this House and advocate legislation

that would be for the betterment of our own people.

Now these tactics of mine may be construed by any section of the press or the house to be deliberate tactics of 'hang 'er down' or 'hold 'er up.' I want to say that there is no such desire within me. I have no desire to delay this house one second longer than is necessary to conduct the legitimate affairs of the country; but I have this desire that I will not allow this house to close one second sooner than it should, if I feel that by my objections, my criticisms or by my advice, I can add to any debate, or by my addition enhance the conditions for any section of our people.

Isay, sir, I am prepared to remain here until October next. These are my sole sentiments which prompted me this afternoon to rise in my place and suggest the argument that I am now about to introduce. It is a well known fact that a great portion of our people engage in the fishing industry and go down to the sea in small boats; these boats are known as 'glicerines,' but I do not known what the term means. I remember when I was fishing myself on the Groais Islands in the district of St. Barbe and I took my supplies at Little Bay Islands, the home of the Hon. Capt. Jones. I feel that I have had considerable experience, not experience that was told me by some fellow that had been fishing or by some politician who wanted me to work his end of the game, but the experience that counts, and I paid the cost. And I might state here that a number of gentlemen in this house were dumbfounded when they discovered that I had engaged in so many industries, and they thought that I was putting one over on them. Not so; any statement that I make in my place in this house, I am prepared to fall by it; even to make an affidavit. And being a practical fisherman, surely I am to be given some notice from a fishermen's government.

Now I challenge the Leader of the Government or the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to point out the practical fishermen who occupy seats on the government side and compare them with those who occupy seats on the opposition side, and find out where the most practical information can be found. I merely interject this part of my debate in an honest desire to try and improve conditions for the great mass of our people, who, to-day are struggling along with an almost unbearable load upon their shoulders. These people are called upon to pay dollar for dollar with the large and wealthy capitalist, who is allowed to continue to take advantage of his very profitable business without interruption. I think that the most deserving class of people in the country are those represented by hon. members whom I see here this evening.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to delay the committee in this stage of the bill, but arising out of the remarks which I made yesterday regarding the objectionable feature of the bill, there are a few words that might be added. I appreciate very much the approach which the hon. minister has made since yesterday towards meeting the objection. He realizes the highly objectionable aspect of this assembly voting away money to which these people are not entitled to by law. We are in quite a different situation from the executive minister recognises that the refund could have been made on executive responsibility. Whilst that point is one that no one is going to gainsay, it is no reason why we should legalize something that is wrong in principle. If voted on executive responsibility it would be something for which the government alone would be responsible. But, Mr. Chairman, the point which the

hon. minister has not yet considered is the coming into this assembly and making laws to suit a few people, not alone a vicious principle, but is particularly objectionable because of what has been disclosed regarding this particular amendment. The minister has himself confessed that there is something about it that he did not want to have done on the responsibility of the executive government.

This is not merely a matter of idle opposition nor a matter of caprice for the sake of delaying the passage of a bill. The hon. minister himself has distinctly told us that this section has but one object and one only, namely to give to certain persons whose names he has given to the house, moneys that they are at present not entitled to receive. We have been told that since 1917 vessels beyond the class of 120 tons (and now made 130 tons) were not entitled to the bounty or to free entry on material used in their construction. The hon. minister has narrowed the issued down to the extent where he comes in here and tables a statement showing who is to benefit by this section. The only purpose of it can be to benefit people who have vessels launched since 1919 and the total amount involved is calculated to be in the vicinity of 7,000 dollars, to be given to the persons whose names are on this list, namely, Marystown Trading Co., $1,650; Buffett & Co., $1,796; S. Harris Ltd., $1,381; D. Pelley, $709; F.P.U. $900.

Now, I would like to say that there is one aspect of this which strikes me as being peculiar and somewhat out of place, and that is the cases of Pilley and the F.P.U., who do not seem to fit in here. Harris and Buffett should not be approached in the same way or placed in the same class as the bearer of that illustrious name which has also been given to one of the vessels on this list, President Coaker. Such examples of democracy and aristocracy should not be placed on the same level, nor do I think that the vessel bearing the illustrious name should be made the subject of legislation of this kind. A name we have often heard applied to the hon. minister is the "Worthy" President, and surely it is not "worthy" of the "worthy" minister that he should come in here and take away from himself that power which he was supposed to have by connecting his name with those of persons who are seeking concessions from the government to which they can lay no just claim. True the name of the vessel owned by the concern has been placed at the end of this list and is only in lead pencil and perhaps his name is there only in spirit of his characteristic charity, but this is not what we had been led to expect of him. This house is seriously asked tonight to vote amounts of money to Harris, Buffett and others, to shove back the hands of the law, to give these poor people the sum of $5,000 out of the public funds of the country. Is that the principle that the hon. minister should support? If this thing had been done on executive responsibility we would have nothing to say to it here, but that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should come in here and ask this house to pass legislation of this character is not at all in accordance with what we had expected of him, nor sir, is it in keeping with doctrines he has advocated that he should be the one to bring in and endeavor to pass "class" legislation, for we can call this nothing else.

I say that if this measure was even justified by the fact that these people were led to expect this refund there would be some purpose in passing it, but how can we justify it? These vessels were built at a time when the owners knew that they were not entitled to the bounty or the free entry of ma-

terial, and surely it is no part of our duty because people apply to the government or to this house and set up a justification that, they thought they were going to get certain concessions, that we in our charity should give them what they ask for. In the first place the principle is unsound because, as I have already pointed out, these people don't need our charity, but nevertheless we are all human, and if they can get the hon. minister big-hearted enough to depart from his former high ideals of what is just and right nobody can blame them if they take all they can get. But sir, I doubt very strongly if the hon. minister has an idea that there is anything morally or legally right about the thing this house is asked to do. Of course we can make it legal by passing this section, but when we sit here and allow this section for which we are told there is no justification to go through, we are doing something which is bound to have farreaching effects.

Why, sir if people all over the country had cause to expect concessions of any kind we should be justified in granting them to as great an extent as we would in granting the request of the clause. This is nothing more nor less than a hold-up, a putting of the gun to the head of the government by certain people who have certain influence or power. Ithink that the object of passing such legislation is not worthy of a government that came into power leading us to expect something so entirely different. We should remember moreover, that when we sit here we are in a different position from that which certain of the hon. members on the other side of the house occupy as the government of the day. What they do as such is done on their own responsibility, but when we come in here to consider this matter as a legislature it is a different position altogether, and I would urge upon the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that this is not a question of amount, it is not a question of the $7,000, but it is a question of our setting up a position for which I venture to assert there is no precedent.

To say the government can come in here and ask this House to give effect to legislation that will mean the paying of money to people who are neither morally nor legally entitled to it, is going too far. Of course if the Hon. Minister wants to pass this bill as it stands he can do so, but I say this, and I hope it will be taken in the spirit in which it is meant, that he is sowing something that will give him and give this House trouble in the future. He is making his first great mistake.

The position, as I said yesterday, teing taken towards the men who own the boats is like rubbing grease into the fatted cow. It may be possible that the vessele are now only making their first voyage but that does not materially alter the position. There is a sort of exception in the list, the schr. "President Coaker." This ship was built by a shipbuilding company for the F. P. U. here is this much to be said about that class of boat, it was built by a firm which might be looked upon as a sort of co-operative company. But to return to the ordinary business man it is the same position as going down and have the merchants on Water Street get a rebate on all the goods they have imported. They have just as much right to expect a rebate, it is the same position practically speaking. These people approached the government because they said others got it and they thought they ought not be discriminated against. If a House of Assembly be asked to always consider legislation in the spirit that it ought to

be enacted in such a way that the people would not be discriminated against, then we are going to set up a queer condition of affairs. If for a period of ten or twenty years the people were not entitled to a rebate, and at the end of that time legislation was passed allowing a rebate on ships built in the future would it not be just as reasonable as in this case to urge that those building during the intervening ten or twenty years should get the rebate.

If this were not done these people would have been discriminated against because the law was not made retroactive. The only justification you have to offer for the insertion of the clause in question is that the Marystown Trading Company or Harris, or Pelley, or the organization of the F.P.U., have been discriminated against. There hasn't been a single argument brought out in their behalf to prove the justification of their claims except that they have been discriminated against. If that's the only article you will always have people being discriminated against. If we are going to consider this only as a reason, it is one which will have no support. Another point in moving in this amendment is the fact that they have said they thought they were going to get a rebate, that's why they built the vessels. If we believe everything they say and they once discover the government was going to trat them over kind and that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had a heart that was easily touched, then you will be in for a time of it. It is not a question over which we should have a division; it is our duty on which our attitude is marked. It is not a creditable thing to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and it is not in the interests of these people themselves. It is a black mark in the life of one who claims to have so few against him that he will regret in the future. It is not that I object to the $17,000 being paid so far as the amount goes, but to be paid to these people under the guise of the encouraging of shipbuilding. We should be paying to people who have built ships, that is not an encouragement to build ships. I have no objection whatever in the wide world to these people getting that rebate so far as they are personally concerned, but I do object to the proposition that these people have influence enough to get the government to degrade itself and pass such an act. I have the greatest objection to this being done. I will vote against this and in due time move an amendment.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES:—The cost of everything that went into our vessel increased from two hundred to two hundred and twenty per cent. I believe that the other gentlemen were in the same position. When they made up their minds to build these vessels, they contemplated getting that $900 rebate.

MR. HIGGINS:—They had no right to contemplate any such thing.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—They did not know and we would not have built that vessel of ours, if we had known those laws were there. Our shipbuilding company, I might say, will never ask for that rebate under that act, but that is no reason why the other men should not. The attitude of the opposition only leads me to think that instead of coming in here and being straight and above board, that it is better to do things in the old way, namely, through the executive council to enable us to put through matters by minute of council. I believe we would get more respect here if we did things in the underhanded way in the executive council like the late administration did.

MR. HIGGINS—The case is so

bad that you would not make your own claim.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Chairman, with the permission of the House and subject to the criticism of the hon. member for Burin, I would like to say a few words on this amendment. I was not in the House when the hon. Minister ff Marine and Fisheries brought down this amendment. Might I say in reply to the Hon. Minister of Justice that I did not object yesterday to sub-section two of this bill being passed merely because it repealed legislation. The hon. minister said that every Act passed in the legislature must have the effect of repealing any previous legislation. My main objection is on principle and retroactive legislation is the principle n this matter because it spoils the effects of the statute laws of the Colony. That is what I disagree with. I consider, and, as I informed the House yesterday, that legislation of a retroactive character is wrong and vicious in principle, and we cannot with any degree of security or any degree of comfort anticipate what the future may hold for this Colony if we set up the precedent, as attempted by this proposed enactment.

As regards the particular cases cited in the information laid on the table of the House by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that does not sway me from my position anything at all. That matter is purely a personal one. In one respect, perhaps, it explains the reason why the hon. member for Burin became somewhat alarmed with me yesterday. I notice that one of the interested parties that would benefit by the passage of this enactment is the Marystown Trading Company; another is Buffett and Company, and another Samuel Harris, Ltd.

Well, it might be laudable for any particular member of this House to get up and support this measure, especially with reference to the advantages that are going to accrue to certain people in his own district. Might I point out to him and to other members of this House who may be under a similar impression, that when he comes in on the floors of this assembly, he no longer represents one constituency; he no longer is to regard any laws that would be advantageous for his own constituency to the detriment of the others; but, under the constitution, he is responsible to the people of Newfoundland generally. And in this respect I say that this legislation will not be to the benefit of the whole people of Newfoundland. The effect is to ask the taxpayers of Newfoundland to go to the public treasury and hand out seven thousand dollars to four or five different people. I strongly object on principle and I contend that it should not be tolerated. It will not only have the effect of class legislation, but suggests personal legislation. I repeat that we are not passing legislation for the people of Newfoundland under this bill; we are not directing our attention properly.

As regards the Hon. Mr. Coaker's vessel, that matter is purely a personal one. I note with interest what he says about the building of that vessel. Of course, nobody will give too much attention to the excuse which he proffers. It is a well known principle in law that every man in the country is supposed to know the law; no man can plead ignorance of the laws that are on our statutes; and if the owners of that vessel had her built under a delusion, that there is no justification for coming in here now and saying, gentlemen for the delusion allow us to give those people bounties and rebates, which strictly in accordance with the law of the land should not be recovered. The same applies to other vessel owners. We cannot allow the argument to be reflected upon

by an issue of that sort. We must confine ourselves to one or two principles. The law of the land being such and such, has a man any right to say that he does not know it? No matter what you thought, it cannot effect the situation. No man, who had a vessel constructed, had any right to think that legislation for the future will be enacted giving you certain concessions that the law of the land forbade. If a anm is foolish enough and guideless enough to depend upon the promise of politicians to bring down legislation that would benefit his own case and later finds that it cannot pass this House, then he has only himself to blame. If we allow the proposition to go unchallenged, any man who believes such and such a thing and is competent to get a bill put through the legislature of this country, then we do not know where the iniquitous principle is going to end.

An amendment is now brought down that vessels launched in 1919 shall have rebates, but when we come to regard it in a practical light we realise that the same vessels which the act of 1917 does not cover. When we read this bill the words themselves attempt to camouflage the issue. We cannot with any degree of consciousness recognize any principle of the sort involved and I do not see how any man can sooth his conscience on this point and can come in here and attempt to pass legislation of such a vicious nature. We know that this retroactive clause will cover vessels launched last year. We ask to regard the main objection brought before the House that we are here tampering with legislation for the financial betterment of certain individuals. Even the clause as amended includes those vessels whose keels were laid after 1917 and therefore the principle remains and the clause should not be so. Legislation of yesterday, the day before, ten months ago or twenty years ago, no matter when, the principle is the same.

If we should allow you to come in here and pass an enactment with such a vicious principle behind it, we would not be living up to the ideals of decent political economy and in short the public legislation of the country would be upset and this should not be tolerated. And this very thing we are doing when we come and think that the legislation involved in this bill is of a retroactive nature. This retroacticve section is for a certain class of persons for their advantage solely and we are not going to allow certain individuals to go down to our treasury which contains sums to devote to the uses which the law of the land says shall not be recognized and distinctly states that the rebates contemplated by this section shall not be paid. I would ask the hon. minister to consider this point in its serious phase and in its ethical light, and I impress upon the hon. gentleman that this ethical side of the issue should not be lost sight of. We could not permit pernicious precedents of this sort to take place because if we did we could not tell what would happen in the future. The House may not be constituted of the same honorable gentlemen who occupy seats here now and in particular there may be certain sections of the country with whom the government of the day may be very friendly, and it would come in here and pass iniquitous legislation of this kind for the particular advantage of these particular people and then the people of the country will say that such a precedent should not be upon the statute books.

The result of this precedent will be that bills will be brought in here and made law to the detriment of this

country. This embodies my main objection, whether you construe the section as meaning vessels whose keels were laid in 1919 or launched in 1919, the principle is just the same and I object very forcibly to this amendment and it is a mere camouflage to pass an enactment to cover vessels whose launching is only a few months off; it is an audacious attempt to bring down before this House a bill embodying an iniquitious principle of legislation. The minister of marine and fisheries says that unfortunately some enterprising people laid keels of ships thinking they would get a rebate. This legislation is simply providing for contingencies that overtake some people owing to their unbusinesslike and shortsighted method of doing business. They expected to make a profit and they find they do not, well they have themselves to blame. That is no justification for passing legislation of this character. If some enterprising person undertakes a venture and a profit which was contemplated does not materialize why should I condone going down to the public treasury and taking out money to sooth the financial feeling of the loser by paying back his losses which were incurred through his own short-sightedness and unbusiness-like method.

To contend that legislation should depend upon this sort of a principle is outrageous. To say that those in control of the affairs of the country will compensate for private losses out of the people's money is ridiculous. I have never heard of legislation of such an iniquitous character based upon such a vicious principle as this and that is my main objection. The argument of the honorable member for Burin and to some extent that of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries cannot be taken seriously. The member for Burin was amusing. He said certain persons thought that certain things would be done, that rebates would be granted. Now they want us to help them in going down to the treasury and pay these individuals money for losses to which they are not entitled to pay them for three years' losses sustained by certain firms owing to their business shortcomings. It comes to this that a man who owned goose-berry bushes will come along and ask for compensation for a poor crop of berries he had twenty years ago. Just think of it. I never heard of the like. I consider there is no right to pass legislation of this sort. But this contention is negatived by trying to pass sectoin two. We would certainly boost shipbuilding along decent lines. We will do everything in our legitimate power to provide and promote shipbuilding whether now or in the future, and it is the policy of the Opposition to do and they will not turn down any reasonable request for the encouragement of shipbuilding. I say sincerely that it is our duty to encourage shipbuilding in every material manner and we will grant a bounty when we can to those business men who go into a venture the profit of which not only accrues to themselves but also to the country. We would endorse any principle of that sort, anything of a laudable nature. But we are not going to allow an enactment to go through which will permit anybody to go down to the public treasury and take money out to soothe their wounded financial feelings because of losses sustained during the last three years. If the venture depended upon a principle of this sort then everybody will be looking for the same privilege.

We cannot condone legislation that tampers with the funds of this country. I object to it strenuously. If a precedent of this sort is allowed to go through one cannot tell what the fu-

ture of this country will bring to us. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries brought the bill before the House and went so far as to make an amendment and for this he deserves credit.

The hon. gentleman is to be credited with the proper spirit of the legislator in bringing this business before the House, and before the people. But in doing that I cannot give him credit for doing more than his duty. It is his duty to the public and in performing his moral duty he is entitled to no credit. I am not going to pose before the country as one who is doing more than his duty. I want to look at it from a public standpoint. Because he does his duty he wants the country to thank him for it. The member of this House is not alive to his duties who would allow this matter to be disposed of behind closed doors. The other matters of this act are more or less all right, but section three, subsection 2, should not have been brought down here. In 1917 a law was brought down and if any company did something that it didn't know anything about it has nobody but itslef to blame. It is a subject upon which they should have been fully alive. If you allow this to creep in, in the course of a few days two or three people will come in here with a common bull story. You say to a man, you did something a few years ago for which you should receive a rebate, and we are going to give you a rebate. We are going to tell you how much we like you. Now, Mr. Chairman, where is this thing going to end if once we start on it. And then the hon. member for Burin comes in here and says that I am insincere and talking "Simon Pure" stuff. He and I crossed lances yesterday. When he got up he reminded me of a story by Robert W. Service, the "Soulful Sam." If he has not read that sory I would like for him to do so. But I don't want him to come down here with legislation that is not for the best interests of the country. The hon. member must remember that he doesn't represent Burin now. He represents the country as a whole not a few of his constituents. If, for example, the people of Quidi Vidi should ask me to put through some special legislation for them, I would say no, I am sworn to protect the interests of Newfoundland as a whole and I cannot support your proposition. And I want you to realise that when I get up here and advance arguments on sound principle that I am not posing as a "Simon Pure." I want to tell the hon. member for Burin that I do not want to descend to a discussion of personalities as he did yesterday, and if any members decide to do it and get hurt they have but themselves to blame.

Now as regards the statement of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries that the Fishermen's Shipbuilding Co. would not ask for the rebate, I cannot regard that as an argument at all. If you say that you want to get this benefit for a few individuals, we have to take one of two possible positions. First, that the hon. member is too honest and has too much interest in the welfare of the country to take advantage of disastrous legislation, or, second, that the legislation is just, but that he will not take what rightfully belongs to him. On what horn of the dilemma is the hon. gentleman going to sit. Is he going to take the position that he is opposed to the principle but will grant the rebate to certain individuals; or will he decline to take what rightfully belongs to him? The latter course would be absolute robbery of the company of which he is president.

If we face this position as courageously as we should in passing this clause to take out of the public treasury six or seven or eight thousand dollars we will have done our duty.

It is not my money that I am handling. If it was I should probably go down to these men and say I am sorry for you and I am going to give you a cheque to cover your expectations, but once I stand here and control the funds of this Colony I cannot and I am in honor bound not to deflect one single cent from the legitimate channels for which it is intended. We can not of our own special grace for a paltry few in this country give money for this purpose. If my hon. friend the member for Burin wants to treat his friends let him write out a cheque and pass it along to them, but in this case it is not his own money that he has to deal with, it is the public funds of this country and under the law of God and the law of man we are responsible for it. If this government must insist on the passage of this bill with that iniquitous clause inserted, I shall not forget to remind them when they again come to the country that they did this thing with their eyes open. I regard the case with most compassionate eyes, but I have to disassociate myself from the personal and I must remember the duty the people of this country have placed upon my shoulders. We are bound to do nothing that will conflict with the public affairs of this country. I say that it is immoral for us to condone legislation of this sort. I say that it is immoral for us to inflate the private accounts of the Marystown Trading Company and others at the expense of the public funds of the Colony much as we would like to see them inflated. I must remember as a public trustee of the public funds I cannot give way to my personal feelings in this respect. I say that if $8,000 is taken from the treasury to fatten the bank rolls of a few individuals the government one day will answer for it to the people who they are sent to represent. I don't care if it is $8.00 or $800.00, the principle is the same. This thing has to stop I am rather surprised, absolutely surprised, that gentlemen of such political experience as those sitting on the government side of this House should show such lamentable ignorance of the first principle or political economy and when I come down with a bill and there is anything objectionable in that bill I have to explain to the House why it is that I am going to allow that iniquitous principle to operate. There you have Sir, an example of a most plausible enactment being dissipated by the concluding clause in it. Under the last section we are doing something which should have a bad effect on the conditions in this country we are building up with one hand and tearing down with the other. On this position I differ with the hon. member of the government who have supported this measure. We endorse everything for the encouragement of shipbuilding we must not grant any concessions to these people. In passing retroactive legislation we are doing something which is altogether wrong because in the future governments will come in that will probably be passing legislation that will date back 20 or 30 or 50 years, and it is not improbable that they will tav us back to the days of our forefathers.

If we are going to condone the principle of retroactive legislation, we must be prepared to meet the evil consequences that are bound to follow. It is time that men, who govern the administration of the affairs of this country, should realise the serious obligations they assume, and that when they come here to open this house they will not be in a manner much to the amusement of the galleries; that we have something more serious in view than playing to the newspaper critics and that we are not

going to get off some smart saying that is going to tickle the fancy of somebody here; that we are not going to have enacted any vaudeville stunt that would be analagous to a panorama; or that we are not going to let pass from opposite sides any abusive remarks for the amusement of some highly fanciful one, who will paint a picture in large type to send broadcast over this country. No, sir, the people who sent us here and who own this assembly are not concerned about these things, but what they are interested over is that, as legislators, we rigorously perform our public duty. We have one object in coming here to take our seats and that is to see that public business is transacted in the most judicious manner; and what is more, that in our legislative enactments we guarantee our actions and convictions, and that we will not violate any principle in the administration of the solemn duties cast upon our shoulders to perform. We have to confine our own personal feelings; I have to forget that I am opposed to the gentlemen opposite; and I have to forget the feelings that were so embittered by the opposing political parties of this country, and I have to forget the downfall of any opponents, except for the fact that I am here as a public servant sworn to do my duty to the people in a proper manner, and it is time for this house in this supposedly enlightened twentieth century to see that a realization of its duties is raging in the breasts of every man who comes on these floors. I do not agree with playing the part of obstruction from the sordid political viewpoint; I do not believe in holding up a discussion lengthily, but if legislation is about to be enacted that I disagree with, not alone do I conceive it my duty to hold up, but I will oppose with every force at my command the passage of enactments that spell ruin for the country. Therefore, it is in this spirit that I approach this argument. I am in accord with the first three sections of the bill, but I am in total disagreement with this principle underlying sub-section two. I commend the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who conceived that act, on the bill as a whole. I can conceive the heavy work done by hon. minister and with all respect to all gentlemen whose position he now holds, there is no man who can perform the duties incumbent upon that office as ably and efficiently and more advantageous to the country than the Hon. W. F. Coaker. I believe that if there is one man in the country who will not sparehimself in the interests of the largest portion of the population of this country that that man is the Hon. W. F. Coaker. I do not say this in the spirits of fulsome flattery. But I repeat that the President of the Fishermen's Protective Union, who, by his intelligence, energy and industry has done so much in his various enterprises on behalf of the people who put him in that high position is deserving of the highest commendation. It is quite true that I do not agree with the political principle underlying his organization but I believe that the Hon. Mr. Coaker, with the exception of my own leader, has done the greatest work in public life to_day; and I say that the future D. W. Prowse of Newfoundland will paint the name Coaker in colours that will never fade, and even if the hon. gentleman was not here before me to-night I would say that he is the biggest power within the four shores of Newfoundland to-night and wields the biggest influence. I say, sir, that such a man's responsibilities must be enormous. Why the responsibilities of a Prime Minister must be light compared to such a man , who controls some thirty or forty thousand fishermen of the Island. I have often pondered over the praiseworthy and commendable vitality and the clever-

ness of that man, who unknown ten or twelve years ago when he set out to revolutionize the conditions under which the fisher folk of Newfoundland live. On the principle of proper political economy I do not agree with him. I do not think it is right for any corporation to have the power at its control to send men here to control the government of the country.

Inferences have been made that my colleagues and myself have been prolonging the debates by obstruction. I want to say that such is not the case, because if it were so I can conceive of nothing easier than for the few men on this side of the house to hold up the public business from passing through and making the government members procure the assistance of first aid ladies and gentlemen to bring them their meals.

MR. SAMPSON:—I would like the hon. member sitting on the opposite side of the house (Mr. Fox) to explain what is the use of repeating the same thing over and over again. I think it is only obstructing legislation.

MR. FOX:—Well sir, it all depends upon what one is repeating. When you repeat a cogent argument it has a very impressing effect and this is why there has been repetition of it. The gentleman who hear will I am sure be impressed and therefore recognise the logic of it. The hon. gentleman is a friend of mine and I have a frank admiration for him but I am only answering his question and may go further and say you cannot hear too much of a good thing. This is a matter you should never lose sight of or tire of hearing. There is something worth while in the argument of the opposition and the same principle applies and the men who take conscientious interest in the affairs of their country such as the honorable members of this house should never tire of hearing salient truths. And it is really astounding to me to find honorable gentlemen here in this house endeavoring to pass legislation of such iniquitous character. They ought never lose sight of the welfare of their country. If they come into this chamber and seriously attempt to pass an enactment involving such a pernicious principle. I say that they are delinquent to their duties and are disgracing the legislature of this country. Any legislator being a party to such an attempt, an attempt to pass a measure having a vicious, iniquitous principle such as this one, surprises me beyond expression. The members of the opposition are here occupying their seats for one purpose and for that purpose they were sent here. If we allowed legislation of that sort to go through, if we did not vehemently protest, we would be sadly neglecting our duty of checking the legislation of this country. This is no party measure.

If I were a member of a party to-mor row and they attempted to pass legislation with a principle of this kind underlying it and I could not convince them that they were wrong, then I would leave them. I cannot imagine that public men can so far forget themselves, can forget the knowledge they may already have, as to allow a principle to control the legislation of this country such as is contained in this bill they are attempting to put through. I am surprised. I would excuse the hon. gentlemen if they lacked knowledge of political economy, if they did not recognise the various principles, but the nature of the attempted legislation is of such an iniquitous character, it is so obvious that I am astounded. This section is violating the principles of this house while the act is otherwise perfect. The efforts of the Honorable Minister of Marine and Fisheries are being spoiled and an otherwise perfect act is being frustrated by the inclusion of this sub-section two of clause three. If this section were there there would

be no comment whatever. I therefore ask the Honorable the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to delete this section and then we will have a perfect enactment. Sections one, two and three are alright but section two of clause three is morally and logically wrong. I have endeavored to show to the house the altogether wrong motive they may have sustained they may indulge upon their super_abundance of principle and do so. But men of public experience, the legislators of this house ought not to pass legislation that is directly detrimental to country and legislation of this sort proposed is indeed very pernicious to the interests of those who send me here, who sent me here to frustrate any attempts to pass legislation that tends to prove detrimental to them. Is it legitimate to go down and take out of the treasury the people's money to be devoted to the use of private individuals? For this reason this reason this clause is not right. I may say that if any of the honorable gentlemen on the other side wish to compensate their friends for some losses and am sure that if the opposition were the government tomorrow and they attempted to introduce a section in a bill of this sort the present government then being the opposition would strongly oppose such an attempt his section is frustrating the otherwise good attempts of the honorable minister and it is a negation of all the good contained in the act.

I would ask the honourable Minister of Marine and Fisheries to consider his serious responsibilty as Minister of the Crown in introducing a bill with such a clause included in it and would he not consider himself doing right by the people whom he represents by deleting the objectionable section. I hope then the honourable gentleman will admit that the clause is not right and will therefore strike it out, but I look more so to the cabinet for that serious consideration which this section deserves and after they give it that consideration I have no doubt that its obvious ridiculousness will reveal itself.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—Sir, I realize after hearing the several discussions from this side of the House as to the giving of rebates to certain parties I would not be living up to the traditions of this seat which I now occupy if I did not rise and reveal my disappointment in the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in introducing a bill of this kind and my objection to the retroactive clause contained therein. Before I go further I would like to ask the honourable gentleman if it is correct that so far as the F. P. U. are concerned they are not going to apply for the $900.00.

THE HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—Yes, I said that.

SIR JOHN C. CROSBIE:—Well then that at least you will not take $900.00 but for the life of me I can not understand why you are fighting for some other man. I regret that Mr. Harris who is in Florida, Mr. Buffett who is at Grand Band and the gentleman who is in charge of the Marystown Trading Company, are not here to hear the charges made against them.

MR. BENNETT—Mr. Chairman, I want it to be understood that I do not want to embarrass the government or to obstruct the government in any legislation that may be brought forward, but I want to place myself on record as being opposed to this bill. Unfortunately a discrepancy has been allowed to come in which is a reverse of the enactment of 1917. Previous to 1916 the need for vessels in our trade was obvious, and the government undertook to give a bounty to encourage the building of ships. In 1917 it was discovered that the building of large

vessels was contemplated on a large scale by foreign capitalists. The Hr. Grace Shipbuilding Company has been mentioned in this connection. These people were encouraged by our legislation to build ships in the Colony. They built the ships and then sent them outside of the country. They were not used in the country at all. The present Minister of Marine and Fisheries at the time pointed the matter out to the executive government, and he was quite right. In 1917 the bounty on large vessels was stopped.

When the bill promising bounty for shipbuilding was first introduced the entry of foreigners into the shipbuilding industry in this country was not anticipated. Fortunately the act was availed of in the right manner by our people and during the years of the war some very fine vessels were turned out of our shipyards, vessels which took up the foreign trade of the country when steamers were no longer available, and saved our commerce so that in this respect the government which was responsible for that bill can claim a great deal of credit. It was money well spent and it returned a hundred fold to the colony. Vessels to the value of one and a half millions of dollars were built under this act.

With regard to the Bill we now have under consideration, the objections to sub-section 2 of section 3 have already been well and ably ventilated by other members on this side of the house and it would but be laboring the question for me to take up that aspect of the matter. The principle involved is a vicious one as has been so clearly pointed out by Mr. Fox, and when provision was made to give the bounty to those who laid down keels prior to the act of 1917, the matter should end there as the legislature intended that it should. There is nothing to warrant us passing sub-section 2 of section 3 of this act and now that the duty has been paid on the material used in the construction of those vessels there is no reason why those who paid it should receive a rebate. The Hon. Minister in charge of the bill says we will bring in an amendment by striking out the words "keels laid since 1917," and vessels launched in 1919." This, however, does not alter the position in the least because the list before us is that of vessels launched in 1919. They were built by the Marystown Trading Co., Harris, Ltd., Buffett & Co., the F. P. U. and others, and I take it that the keels of these vessels were laid since 1917 so that the amendment does not alter the situation. It is not to the individuals who will benefit by this measure that I object but I do object to some men on the government side of the House trying to make good promises made last fall by paying back money to men and concerns who are engaged in a paying industry, for no person will deny that whatever the building of vessels may have been prior to the war, it was attended by large profits during the past three or four years. We have heard here of vessels paying for themselves in one trip, and surely a vessel that can do this is a profitable asset. I know of firms in this town myself who have grown rich by their vessels during the war. This is not a question of helping a cripple over a stile, but rather, as Sir John Crosbie has put it, it is gvng to hm who hath and takng from hm that hath not."

I am glad, sir, that the government did not exercise their right of doing this on executive responsibility, I am glad that they brought it into this House and gave us on this side a chance to place on record our disapproval of such a principle as is here

involved. I can easily appreciate the fact of Mr. Foote having valuable supporters in Burin District and his saying to them: "I am going to put you on the same footing as those who have received this bounty, but that is no reason why this House should be expected to pass this unjust and unreasonable measure. I am sorry that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has seen fit to lend himself to this act of the government, but I am glad that he at least had the decency not to take his share of this money. That very act of the hon. minister is the best answer to the contentions of the other side and the best proof that the principle we on this side are advocating is right, honest and above board. Itrust that the minister will consult with Mr. Foote and Mr. Cheeseman, the hcn. members for Burin, and have this objectionable clause withdrawn, for I say, sir, that it is bound to react upon the men who pass it. It has not even the cloak of charity to recommend it.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Now, for the life of me, I cannot see why we should make this act retroactive. The act otherwise is absolutely perfect. If you are not going to look for it yourself surely you are not going to argue for it for other. Why we should go back three or four years to give somebody money out of the funds of the country is beyond me. I can understand you pretty well, sir. But, you say, if I withdraw that bill, if I do that, they will crow over it in the papers to-morrow. I promise you, sir, that it will not appear in the papers. I will tell the Daily News not to mention it. When you realize it is wrong, you ought not to give it to Mr. Harris, Mr. Buffett, or anybody else. I have no intention of doing any obstruction work. We are not driving the nail in the same hole, Mr. Jennings. We have heard the legal lights on the bill, and I believe they are right. I believe we should not make retroactive legislation. But, might we not ask you, sir, to give this matter 24 hours consideration. I believe that if you had another sleep on it everything would be alright to-morrow. I do not believe in the principle of retroactive law, and if it is wrong in principle it should not be done. I want to put myself on record as being against Harris, the Marystown Trading Co., Buffett, or anybody else getting any money back and I want it to be clearly understood. You, sir, are not going to take it, then why give it to the other fellows. You would give in now only you are afraid we are going to crow about it. If you give these men this money it will almost fulfill the scripture: "To those that hath shall be given, and from those that have not shall be taken away." I have no desire to obstruch legislation, but I am appealing to you not to do for others what you would not do for yourself. If these other gentlemen were here they would also be persuaded with you that it is wrong, and they too would withdraw their claim.

MR. MacDONNELL—Mr. Speaker, regarding the statements made about the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries I am not prepared to reply as to their accuracy or inaccuracy, while he may know as much as I do about it, even the most learned doctors have differed on many points, but I am not prepared to stand for that clause and assist in the passing of an act which I know to be wrong.

The sole objection of this bill is sub-section 2 of section 3, and I believe the passege of this bill with that clause inserted would be a blow at the constitution of this country. I am not opposed to a question of dol-

lars and cents, but to the question of whether it is right or wrong to spend any money at all in such a case. The amount being so small we could easily let it go through, but I submit that if wrong and I believe retroactive legislation to be wrong, and though this is a small matter a conglomeration of many such matters would be something serious to contemplate. A snowball on the top of a mountain may look nothing yet it might be an avalanche before reaching the bottom. The constitution of a country is a mechanism which is very delicate and when anything is directed towards the constitution we should be very careful we don't disorganize the whole system.

Everything is founded on a matter of compromise and it is necessary for everyone of us to see that the two sides of the question be observed. It is only necessary to view the history of the constitution and you will find ready authority for the position which I now take. The old laws began to disappear as cities began to grow, but a new principle arose; a principle which still remains that each man should be prepared to surrender a certain amount of his personal liberty and right that general good may come of it. Our government to-day is founded on this principle. We all sacrifice some of our personal liberty for this reason. And if any man has any reason to believe that any other citizen is favored in any respect in which he is not, then, sir, there begins to be a certain discontent which subsequently becomes universal. Now then in this very section under discussion we find certain individuals to be treated in a particular manner different from the general public. I submit, sir, that the risk is too great for this assembly to pass any such legislation. It is very easy to pass from a democratic government of tyranny by the single passage of this section of this bill. The incipient stage may seem absolutely harmless to us. It may seem at first blush to me conferring upon individuals directly and indirectly upon the community certain advantages, but we must remember that we are not entitled to do that. We were sent here to preserve the principles of the people and to safeguard the privileges and interests of the people. We were not sent here to penalize 240,000 people for the advantage of four or five. Why should any one man in this country have to pay one cent in order that a bounty or rebate of duty should be given to men who have no claim thereto.

If this was a country in which the rate of taxation was low there might be some excuse, but we are paying an abnormal per capita rate of taxation already in this country, and I fail to see what justification any hon. member on the other side of the House would have to increase that burden by one hair's breadth for the benefit of 4 or 5 people. It may be that certain parties in the government and, who, perhaps, are not in the executive government, made promises to supporters that they had no authority to make. They led certain people to believe that if they went on with the building of vessels that subsequently it would be alright.

That may be perfectly true, but we are not bound to accept the theory of irresponsibles. We in this House have got to be shown the basis for such an enactment of any legislation, and if the thing is constitutionally unsound, as I believe it is, and there has been no argument brought forward by any member of the government to show that this is not so, this House should take nothing else into consideration except that one fact. This House cannot start in to lay out a theory by

which the priviliges of our people will be sacrificed and the common constitution of our country made a scrap of paper of. That may seem a large way to look at a small question, but that is the logical consequence of such questions. This is the conclusion that other men arrived at when they introduced a bill ten times as far-reaching as this one. When you come to that stage, Sir, you come to a condition when the government is not of the people, for the people and by the people; you come to a state where you got bureaucratic government and where you are in the first stage of a journey towards tyranny. Hon. gentlemen on the other side can take the chances if they like, but the time will come when the people will see fit to saddle the blame on right shoulders. I wish to put myself on record to-night as stating that this House, if it passes legislation that it knows o be wrong and to be bad, is beginning the absolute destruction of the constitution, which will mean the doing away with the reason for our existence as legislators. That is the thing we will have to decide, simply because I believe that it is necessary that what we do we should do with full realization of the consequences and with our eyes open.

I agree that the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is cognizant of all that pertains to the welfare of the fishermen of this country. I am sure of that. But this is so rabid and so radical a departure from all that I ever thought from the line of action that would be taken by him, that I am almost surprised that a section of this character would find itself in that bill. There has never been a man in this country who has championed the cause of the masses more vigorously and strenuously than the hon. minister himself. And, Sir, he comes into this House and brings in this bill, an excellent bill, but which is absolutely marred and spoiled by this sub-sector less than this: that we must penalize every other man in the country for four or five men for a certain amount, and you and I must pay our share of that duty which is to be refunded to those men.

But what I cannot understand is how the hon. minister became converted to such a theory. He may feel that ethically these men are entitled to consideration. I give him credit for that. But no matter what his private opinion or feelings are towards any particular people, we must not do anything that will bring about the smashing up of the constitution of this country or that we must start in this country in order to satisfy the desires of four or five men, an agitation that will set the seeds of discord over this land. We cannot afford to do that nor can we dare attempt to do anything in any way that tends to lessen the respect which is held and properly held for this honorable assembly. If we take away any of that regard; if by our actions we cause anybody or any number of men to have less respect for the laws of the land, then, Sir, there is an inevitable law of retribution even in this world, which will bring home to us some day the responsibilities for such an action. I submit, Sir, to this House and in particular to the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who has brought in this bill, that he weigh well the consequences to this country as a whole. If it is essential and if it is true that the withdrawal of this section will penalize those four or five men, it is unfortunate and, perhaps, regrettable, but that is all about it. We must try and secure the greatest good for the greatest number. We cannot attempt or try to attempt to make legislation for any paricular individual. While I am sorry that this section should be in the bill, in another

way I am glad that this kind of legislation was introduced at this early stage of this session in order that we may know from now onwards and begin to consider what are likely to be the consequences of every single clause of every bill which we may enact. We have got to do that, and I believe that the hon. minister upon consideration, will see that this criticism from this side of the House is simply and solely, because we believe that this may be a step unintentionally but, none the less insidious by which we would digress from the path we should pursue. It is a step in the wrong direction and a blow to the constitution of our country, and I have yet to hear from any hon. member on the other side of the House justify the enactment of retroactive legislation from the standpoint of political economy of political ethics. We cannot afford to play with any legislation of this chacater, and let us decide here and now that the duty we owe to this country and posterity will be upper most in our minds and that we will see that the rights of the many are safeguarded. Therefore, I will ask again the hon. minister to consider this.

DR. JONES:—Mr. Chairman, I have no intention to attempt to delay the affairs of this House by factious opposition to this measure. I am more or less traveling on a limited license just now and it is to my advantage to have as much legislation as possible put through this House while I am here so that in case my license is cancelled I shall have had some experience when I come back again.

With reference to the section of the bill now before the chair, I wish before it comes to a vote, to record my personal opposition to that section. My opposition is because of the retroactive clause in it, as it is bad in principle and will be bad in effect. No doubt Mr. Coaker, to some extent, realizes that the principle is bad because he gave way so far as his personal interest and the interests of the Fishermen's Protective Union are concerned and admitted it.

But there is another aspect to be taken into consideration and that is that Mr. Coaker's adherents, his loyal supporters who follow him through thick and thin, and take his actions as infallible. My experience among the Coaker supporters in my district has shown me that these men place complete confidence and trust in his infallibility.

So just imagine the effect this retroactive legislation will have in the setting up of a precedent of this kind. The adherents of the introducer of this bill will think that the principle involved is absolutely right and his effort will therefore be backed by these great numbers of men, and I am afraid with bad results in the future. As my colleagues of the opposition have so ably stated in this debate, the giving of bounties for the building of ships, and rebates, and free entries for materials used in the construction and outfitting of ships have my hearty support, but this retroactive principle involved in this section is one to which am utterly opposed and disagree with in every detail.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—We are asked to come in here and hand out five or six thousand dollars. What is the reason? Is not this the right place to give the reason? The hon. member for Burin and the hon. Minister of Justice have expressed themselves in favor of it. It is to fulfil political promises? When we see Mr. Harris of Grand Bank, asking for a refund of a large amount and the Hon. Mr. Foote coming in here and asking on behalf of Mr. Harris that the amount be refunded, it looks suspicious. This is proclaimed to be a Reform Government, and we are confronted now with

legislation of this sort. The Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows that this is not commendable .nd if he had kept his promise this egislation would not have been necesary. If legislation of this sort is going to be brought in here where are we going to end? There is not a man on the other side of the House who has a word to say in favor of the bill, ll dumb, waiting to vote on the enactnent of the bill.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:— I object to the language of the hon. Leader of the Opposition in charging that a member on this side of the House supports this bill as part of a price.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Is this the right legislation to pass? No, you are just as much ashamed to pass it as the one who introduced it. When one is confronted with legislation of this sort after the appeal that was made to the country by the present government, we wonder what is going to be introduced next. We are asked to pass a measure of this kind. It is mere effrontery. It is mere bluff. No justification is given for it. We are asked to vote this to the real profiteers of the country. This man Harris asked me to repeal the "profits tax" law at the price of his support. I declined to do so. I declined to promise him the price.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:— Again I have to object to the unparliamentary language used by the hon. Leader of the Opposition. You refer to a member on this side of the House as using bluff. I object to the word "bluff" as unparliamentary language.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—If unparliamentary, I will take it back. A minute of council would leave an uneasy memory in the minds of the men who would pass it, and we are here asked to legalise a bill, the principle of which is admittedly wrong. It is not just or necessary in any particular There is no justifiable necessity for it, and it will rebound against the government more than any measure that may be introduced. The government promised that the high cost of living would be looked into. They didn't tell the people that a measure would be introduced paying out money to the wealthier concerns in the country. Has no member of the government anything to say on this bill? You must feel that it is wrong, to endorse such legislation as it establishes a precedent that will be absolutely vicious and dangerous.

I believe that Mr. Coaker feels that he is in a false position and he was placed in that false position by the member for Burin, Mr Foote. Will the hon. member for Burin ask the Finance Minister to hand him back the amount paid by him the past two years in profits taxes? Surely it would be just as reasonable as this s. Surely Sir, it is not the intention of the gentlemen on the other side of the House to pass legislation like that. I am in full accord with this bill otherwise, but as soon as I eyed this paragraph the first thing I did was to draw the hon. minister's attention to it. The thing to do Sir, is to stop it from going through. There is a long history in connection with Burin district. Grand Bank itself has got a quarter of a million dollars from the government of the day and the district has a special coastal boat. I don't begrudge the hon. gentleman getting all he con for his district but when it comes to voting special moneys to special people, I for one, will never be a party to it, whether I am on this side or the other side of the House. With these few remarks, Mr. Chairman, I feel it my duty to record my vote against the measure.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to add a word or two to this debate. In be-

ginning, Sir, I would wish to say that I am sorry that the hon. introducer of this bill did not carry out his promise which he made here last evening, that this section would be withdrawn. He volunteered to have the section stricken out. Now, Sir, I am sorry he did not carry out his promise. He would have saved a lot of discussion and a lot of trouble. I firmly believe that the hon. introducer of the bill feels that it is not the right think that the House should adopt that section. It is wrong no matter from what point you view it. I remember and know why the act was changed in 1917. There are more reasons than one, but I will not, owing to the time, attempt to give them all. The reason why the act was changed was because many vessels were, or at least would be built in this country by outsiders from foreign countries at Harbor Grace. They were induced to put a great plant at Harbor Grace. It was made law that certain duties paid on materials brought into Newfoundland for shipbuilding would be refunded. And then considerable amounts of material were brought here to make the industry pay during 1916-17. Then the company gave orders for supply of material from the east, north, south and west throughout the Island. A great industry was started at Harbor Grace and it looked as the Colony would be called upon to pay enormous bounties on vessels built in the country. This was brought to the attention of the government and after due consideration the act was amended and this alteration made.

Those people at Harbor Grace immediately protested in as much as they were induced to come here and operate under the provisions of this act because of the bounties paid by the act and build ships in Newfoundland. Now if the promises were carried out there were some hundred thousand tons of shipping turned out and consequently about one million dollars would have to be paid in bounties. That argument was put forward and the government of the day decided that the bounty would only be paid to ships of 120 tons.

The argument was that the vessels of one hundred and twenty tons were large enough for the banking business of this country. And it was also objected to on the ground that it was not right to pay the bounty to foreign-going vessels.

Now that was done. That was law adopted the Harbor Grace company immediately complained that we did not keep trust with them and immediately prepared to withdraw from Newfoundland. Now what is the condition to-day in Harbor Grace? That great idustry built up in 1916, to-day is gone from Newfoundland and this country received another black eye. This is one of the reasons why the shipbuilding plant at Harbor Grace was destroyed. I am not prepared to tell why the industry fell through. We had no right to do that, and if we were willing to pay the bounty for these vessels the company would not have withdrawn.

This plant meant labor to men of this Colony of every description. It gave men of the South and North labor in getting timber during the spring and winter months of the year. We destroyed all this by changing the act. The intention of the act was the encouragement of shipbuilding among the fishermen in Newfoundland, and therefore limited the bounty to ships of one hundred and twenty tons. It cut out the rich men who were building vessels for carrying our fish to market.

Another reason for this limit was that vessels of three or four hundred tons built here or in the neighboring provinces were either sold or earned freight and in either case they paid

for themselves. It was therefore not reasonable for the Newfoundland government to adopt the policy of paying bounties to such people and to come down and yap out public money to those who have invested their money in shipbuilding and got it all back again. That would have been a wrong principle. There would be no business principle involved in it and it would have done a great harm to the country. It certainly did induce the Harbor Grace company to come here. and why not?

Now this was the law of 1917. You come in here and you want to alter it, you want to change it and make a clause retroactive so as to be able to pay this bounty to three or four individuals of this Colony. It is against the law of the land and is morally corrupt, and for the very same reason we did not pay the Harbor Grace company, and I strongly object to it. If people other than fishermen undertook the venture of building ships fo. an investment and lose their money, they would suffer by their loss, and it is no argument for the introducer of this bill to come down here and try to pass a measure a retroactive act so as to compensate these parties for their loss.

HON. MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS:—Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of taking exception to a remark of the Leader of the Opposition. He stated that the $90,000 given for the spur line at Port Union was part of my price. When he says that I was bought he states what is absolutely untrue and without the slightest foundation whatever. I'll go back to the spring of 1917 when the National Government was formed. The necessity and desirability of forming that coalition was talked over by me with the leader of the F.P.U. and Dr. Lloyd, the leader of the Opposition of that time, and never from first to last was there a mention of a cent of payment one way or another, nor, Sir, am I one cent better off to-day as a result of that amalgamation. I never received a cent. I was never promised a cent nor did I ever ask for a cent in connection with it. I never heard of any bargain and so far as I was aware there was no question at that time of concessions to Port Union. If there was any understanding of the kind it was never spoken of to me.

I was lying in the hospital all the time during the first sessions of the National Government and did not take any part in the legislation enacted at that session. I am aware that concessions were made to Port Union at a later date, but it was only right that these concessions should have been granted to a concern that was so closely connected with the interests of such a large number of our fishermen, and I hurl back the statement he has made on the Leader of the Opposition as an unqualified falsehood, and I demand, Sir, that he retract his statement, which is absolutely without foundation or justification.

MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—My hon. friend has raised a moral issue in his case. I consider it a just claim or the government would not have passed the shipbuilding act in 1916, when all ships received a bonus. It was afterwards decided that all ships should not get a bonus and an amendment was brought in so as to cut down the bonuses to 130 ton vessels or over.

Under the 1916 act all ships at this size were entitled to a rebate and bounty. This was done by the late government and was a legacy to us from them. I have been honest enough to come here and make a clear statement of the case and my hon. friend on the other side of the House should raise the moral issue.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Chairman, as the hour is late I do not want to take up the time of the

House any longer than is necessary. Nobody has made any statements of an objectionable character in the debate unail the leader of the opposition saw fit to introduce uncalled for personalities in his remarks a few months ago. Iwant to assure the hon. gentleman on the other side that no member of the government has any ulterior motive as far as these rebate are concerned. I didn't even know that this clause was in the bill until it was brought before the House.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—You said you were a member of the treasury board.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—This never came before the treasury board. Uulike my hon. friend opposite, we preferred to bring the matter here and discuss it openly.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—That a chestnut.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—That's a chestnut that cannot be roasted too much. If that $7,000 is going to be kept up long, how much longer is that $500,000 going to be kept up? It is only a matter of proportion and I leave it to the hon. gentleman himself to figure it out. What I really got up to say was that no promises of any kind were made by me in connection with this matter and secondly, I want to defend an honest man whose name has been brought into this discussion. One would imagine from the remarks of the gentleman opposite that Mr. George Harris had come to me and asked me to refund him his money. I want to say here that George Harris is a man who rose from the ranks of the fishermen and I am sure that he never did any grafting. He supported me, not because of any promises I made him, but because he considered me the best man, and as far as I am concerned I believe he was right. He never appealed to me after I was elected to do anything for him, because he is above that sort of thing, and I cannot allow these charges to be made against him or the firm of S. Harris Ltd., when I know they are unfounded and only used for political reasons by Michael Cashin.

I was told that Iwas bobbing up and down a few minutes ago but I know who is the chief bobber up. We talk about refund of duties, what have personalities got to do with it. I say that I for one deprecate any personalities in a debate of this sort. I merely got up to clear myself and Mr. Harris.

MR. MacDONNELL:—I think it is very happy comparison between that $7,000 and that $500,000 as the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries was one of those who voted that sum to public works.

MR. HIGGINS:—Apparently a given rule of the road has been established so that each member may get up in their turn., But, I am afraid the Hon. Minister of Justice ably spoke on the spur of the moment. He suggested that the object of the debate was to draw the attention of the House to the $7,000 and that we were asked to forget the $500,000. There is a great difference between the two votes. One has been allocated for the repairs of the public works of the colony, the other is a vote for Harris and Buffett that Pelley and one who has refused to be in the company of such, the corporation of the F. P. U. who are owners of the "President Coaker"

MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—I must thank some of the members on the opposition side af the House for some of the statements they have made Much has been said that might have been left unsaid, but the country will be delighted to know that we have been two days discussing the clause of this act .

Mr. Fox has asked me whether I am to be false to the Shipbuilding Company, or whether I am ashamed

of the issue. I have infinite faith in the moral issue that these men should get their money. I have no right as a member of this House to cast or vote or use my influence to pass any legislation that may benefit myself or any Company I may represent and I therefore withdraw the claim. However, that is no reason why my company should give up its rights to this money, that would otherwise be paid but for the fact just stated. Members of the House should not use their influence to benefit themselves. I have received $1500 since November as salary in connection with my department and board of works, but of that amount I shall pay the Shipbuilding Company the $900 that they must forfeit under this bill, because I cannot permit public moneys to flow to that company, through my vote or influence in this House. This is not the first time our companies have been penalized here and because of this same fact in relation to my connection with public affairs. I refuse our company to have any financial relation with the treasury. None of our companies have sold ten cents worth of goods or have done business with the government in any way since I entered the government in 1917, or for that matter before that time.

Mr. Fox said we are going down to take $7,000 and hand it out to the men. That is not so. They paid the money into the revenue; they are not asking anyone to refund their money. We are just handing them back their own money they have paid in as duty on the material used in building those vessels. All duty on the timber and material used on the ships has been paid for in duty and if these vessels were built in Nova Scotia and sent here, no duties would be collected, and therefore our builders would suffer, while Nova Scotians gained.

If we did not provide a rebate and Bounty in this bill you would find nobody anxious to go into Shipbuilding here in the future. I believe these men have a just claim and as Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I brought the cat into this bill and all the arguments made by members of the opposition have not convinced me that they should not get a rebate.

The reasons to-day are not the same. You canot see a vessel that will make her value in one of two trips. The expenses were not as high then as they are now. We have a vessel that for the last twelve months did not make more than 70 per cent profit The freight rates on steamers are gone up, particularly those in connection with salt carrying. Last year salt was brought in as low as twenty-five shillings per ton freight, now the lowest, I understand is forty shillings. I would like to ask what the Escasoni got last year.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—Forty shillings.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES:—We brought salt in as low as twenty-five and as high as forty. I am indeed pleased with the discussion that has taken place on this shipbuilding bill, but I was sorry with the breeze that occured at the end of it. I kept my patience as much as possible. We have had many a clash before, though I do not think I was the cause of it. However, that is all forgotten about now. I hope that I shall be able to maintain the dignity and responsibilities of my present position.

HON. MR. FOOTE:—Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say a word in regard to the imputation, if not the specific influence, made by the leader of the opposition, that I promised Mr. Harris something for his support.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—I take your word for it. You don't have to make an affidavit.

HON MR. FOOTE:—Mr. Harris is above anything like that and he only wants what is legally due him. I regret very much the personalities introduced in this House. It is very discritable to the opposition.

MR. CHEESMAN:—As Mr. Foote has cleared himself and in view of the idea that the leader of the opposition seems to have, I would like to say that personally I have no knowledge of profits tax or rebate of duty having been introduced into the late election in our district. I had no conversation with any man in the district as far as this bill is concerned I know absolutely nothing about it. I do not know whether Mr. Harris got goods in duty free or whether he had them given him.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—Mr. Chairman, before this rebate closes I would like to ask the Hon. leader of the opposition if he is prepared to take back the charge he made against me, namely, that I was bought.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—I said it in a general way. You were bought as a party man. I do not say individually, but collectively.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—I came over for the motives which I am not ashamed of. The condition of affairs as represented to me at that time required a coalition of the two parties then sitting in this House and for purely national purposes and because it was in the best interests of the country, and for these and no other reasons did I become a party to the National Government. There was never anything about price either as a party man or individually. I demand that the Leader of the Opposition take back the words.

SIR M P. CASHIN:—I do not mean you individually, but collectively.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—I do not take this as a correct apology.

MR. CHAIRMAN—I will ask the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to retract the words.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—I have taken it back. What does he want me to do, make an act of contrition for him?

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Speaker, on motion of the adoption of the report, I would like to move this as an amendment: "That the report of the committeee by amending sub-section two of section three be stricken out.

MR. BENNETT—Mr. Speaker, I second that motion.

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.

On the motion for the adoption of the report, Mr. Higgins moved and Mr. Bennett seconded "that sub-section 2 of section 3 of the said bill be stricken out."

Whereupon the House divided and there appeared for the amendment: Sir M. P. Cashin, Sir John Crosbie, Mr. Bennettt, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Fox, Mr. Vinnicombe, Dr. Jones, Mr. Moore, Mr. Sinnott, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. MacDonnell (11).

And against it:

The Prime Minister, Minister of Justice, Minister of Fisheries, Minister of Posts, Hon. Mr. Foote, Minister of Public Works, Acting Minister of Shipping, Mr. LeGrow, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Small, Mr. Cheeseman, Mr. Hibbs, Mr. Gosse, Mr. Targett Mr. Guppy, Mr. Jones, Mr. Samson (18).

So it passed in the negative.

On the original motion the House divided and there appeared in its favor the Prime Minister, Minister of Justice, Minister of Fisheries, Minister of Posts, Hon. Mr. Foote, Minister of Public Works, Acting Minister of Shipping, Mr. LeGrow, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Small, Mr. Cheeseman, Mr. Hibbs, Mr. Gosse, Mr. Targett, Mr. Guppy, Mr. Jones, Mr. Samson—(18); and against it, Sir M. P. Cashin, Sir John Crosbie, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Fox, Mr. Vinnicombe, Dr. Jones, Mr. Moore, Mr. Sinnott, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. MacDonnell—(11), so it passed in the affirmative, and was ordered accordingly.

It was then ordered that the said bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the bill entitled "An Act respecting the Department of Posts & Telegraphs" 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.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

The Prime Minister intimated that His Excellency the Governor would receive the address in reply at noon to-day.

Mr. Scammell gave notice of question.

Mr. Bennett gave notice of question.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the legislative council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the following bills, entitled respectively:

"An Act respecting the effect and application of certain acts subsequent to the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series)."

"An Act to amend the Industrial Societies Act, 1919."

"An Act to amend Chapter 41 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Newfoundland Medical Board,'" and

"An Act to amend "The Food Control Act, 1917'" without amendment.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until 11.30 of the clock this morning.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

HON THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the correspondence which was ready to be tabled earlier in the day, but was held over owing to the absence of Mr. Fox from the House.

MR. FOX—Mr. Speaker, might I thank the Prime Minister for his courtesy in deferring the consideration of the third reading of the bill respecting posts and telegraphs during my temporary absence from the House this afternoon, not so much to discuss the bill on merit, but that I want the opportunity of discussing the points I raised yesterday in reference to certain correspondence tabled through the courtesy of the Prime Minister. In approaching the subject I shall be very careful in laying the facts before the chair.

Some time ago Dr. Robinson held the position of postmaster-general and conducted it not alone with credit to himself but with exceptional and unusual benefit to the country as a whole. He retired from that position. The position taken by Dr. Robinson's friends was that his retirement was

forced upon him, while the position of the government was that his resignation was voluntary. References were made that Dr. Robinson's refusal to discuss matters pertaining to his department, although Dr. Robinson's contention was that he had refused to discuss matters altogether foreign to the usual duties and function of his office. Accordingly, correspondence was asked for, and, to the courtesy and foresight of the Hon. the Prime Minister, was tabled the day before yesterday. Upon examination of the correspondence a most material discrepancy was noticed. There was correspondence that went to the very root of the situation and which completely prevented Dr. Robinson from setting up a position that he originally claimed, namely, that he was never derelict in his duty; that he never refused to perform duties pertaining to the administration of his department, but simply refused to discuss matters foreign to his departmental duties. The next he knew was that he was asked to send a message notifying the public generally that the Hon. Mr. Halfyard had been appointed as acting postmaster-general.

The discrepancy to which I referred yesterday and which I will now explain was to the effect that the first paragraph of Dr. Robinson's letter was altered in the copies tabled and to this extent.

On the third line of the first paragraph the following words were inserted: "In re the creation of a post and telegraph department." The letter from Dr. Robinson read as follows. (Reads letter.)

Now, according to the information got from the Colonial Secretary's department through the correspondence we glean the fact that Dr. Robinson replied saying he regretted his ability to comply with the request of the Deputy Colonial Secretary to meet the Prime Minister to discuss the creation of a new department of posts and telegraphs.

Now this altered the whole trend and tenor of the correspondence, but to make matters clear I will read a copy of the letter written by Dr. Robinson. (Reads first paragraph.) Now I wish to know of the honorable member how this decrepancy and interpolation referred to by me yesterday came about. Now this interpolation altered the whole trend of the matter and put a different phrase on it, as it gave the people to understand that Dr. Robinson refused to discuss the matters in relation to his office and therefore put the gentleman in an unfavorable light. The copy to which I am referring is under date November 20th, 1919.

When I gave notice of question to the House on this matter the Prime Minister, with his characteristic courtesy, without loss of time, laid upon the table of the House the information asked for and the correspondence speaks for itself. I had an interview with Mr. Mews at my office and I have brought with me here all the information which Mr. Mews gave me. I asked Mr. Mews permission to utilise the information as otherwise no explanation would be forthcoming, and he said I need not regard what he told me as confidential and might disclose anything, he said. Mr. Mews also told me that the Prime Minister was in no way connected with the matter and was perfectly innocent.

Now Mr. Mews rang up Dr. Robinson on the telephone and asked him if he would meet the Hon the Prime Minister to discuss the creation of a post and telephone department, and Dr. Robinson said he would consider the request, and on Nov. 20th wrote this letter to the Colonial Secretary's Department and it reads as follows.

(Reads letter.) Now according to the correspondence and the information laid upon the table of the House there has been an interpolation and to that I object. We must get correct information from the public departments. When I asked the Prime Minister about the matter he immediately rang up Mr. Mews on the telephone and Mr. Mews said he did not know anything about the matter and whatever happened was quite unintentional.

Now we come to the kernel of the situation, when we find that the original letter which was filed in the Colonial Secretary's department has some notes written upon it in the margin and they were. (Reads them.) Now these are the words complete, but why should the information derived from our public departments be so misguiding, and this is what I object to.

Apparently the typist in copying the original letter thought the notes were to go in and there it comes about that these words which were not in the original letter were in the copy of the correspondence which has been tabled here, the day before yesterday. Mr. Mews wrote these notes upon the original letter and sequently the original was copied. I think it is absolutely imperative that we receive correct information from the public departments. The Dominion must know all that transpires and therefore it is essential that correct information be published.

The House met at half past eleven of the clock in the morning pursuant to adjournment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that in accordance with the intimation received His Excellency the Governor would receive the address in reply presently.

Accordingly Mr. Speaker and the House proceeded to Government House and being returned to the Assembly room, Mr. Speaker informed the House that His Excellency had received the address of thanks, and had been pleased to reply thereto as follows:

Government House,
St. John's, Nfld.

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

I thank you for your address in reply to the speech with which your present session was opened.

C. ALEX. HARRIS,
Governor.

May 6tn, 1920.

Mr. Speaker left the chair until three of the clock.

MR. TARGETT—May I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Hillview, asking for a sum of seven hundred dollars for building and repairing Maine Line Road from Hillview to Loreburn. This road is divided into three sections, from Hillview to Hatchet Cove, from Hatchet cove to St. Jones Within, and from St. Jones Within to Loreburn.

I wish to say sir, that several requests have been made, but so far nothing has been done. I hope the government will take up this matter, as this it the main line road leading from Hillview to Northern Bight railway.

MR. WINSOR—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of St. Brendan's in the district of Bonavista, asking for the sum of one hundred and fifty dollars for the purpose of repairing a railing in that locality, known as Mckey's Railing. This was put there some years ago as a safety for the public, as this place was looked upon to be somewhat dangerous, especially in the winter season. This railing now needs repairs. I hope the government will grant the request of the petitioners. I ask that this be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. ABBOTT—Mr. Speaker, I have very much pleasure in supporting the petition presented by my colleague, Mr. Winsor, and hope that the government will see its way clear to grant the request of the petitioners.

MR. GOSSE—I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Bay Roberts and Harbor Grace on the subject of prohibition.

MR. ABBOTT—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the electors of Charlotte Town. The petition asks that the sum of $250.00 be granted them to repair the road leading from Charlotte Town to Port Blandford. This road is in a very bad condition. In fact it is absolutely impassable.

The petition is signed by Allan Chaulk and some sixty or seventy others. I hope that the government will grant this small amount to these referred to the department of public works.

Mr. Sullivan gave notice of question.

Mr. Scammell asked the hon. the minister of finance and customs to lay on the table of this house a statement showing the value of goods, material and supplies imported into Newfoundland for the Anglo Newfoundland Development Co., Ltd., free of duty since the company started business in Newfoundland; and in particular for the years 1916, 1917, 1918 and 1919. Also what refund of duties paid have been made since the company started business.

The hon. the minister of finance tabled the information requested.

Mr. Bennett asked the hon. colonial secretary to lay on the table of the house a copy of all correspondence between the government and F. A. McKenzie of London, England, relative to the war history of the Royal Newfoundland Regiment, also copy of minutes of council passed by the late government in relation to same.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked the Minister of Finance and customs to table a statement showing the amount due in taxes by the Commercial Cable Company to date.

The Hon. the Minister of Finance tabled the information requested.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 176 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'of the Encouragement of Shipbuilding,'" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed, being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the Bill entitled "An Act to provide for the Standardization of Codfish" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole House on to-morrow.

Second reading of bill "An Act to provide for the Standardization of Fish."

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few remarks regarding the Bill. It is generally conceded that the cure of Newfoundland fish is not as good as it might be, and for many years the Fishermen's Union have been discussing the advisability of seeking legislative enactment with regard to the improvement of the cure of our fish. In 1909 at the first convention of the F. P. U. a memorial was prepared respecting the standardization of fish. That memorial was presented to His Excellency the Governor, through Sir Edward Morris at that time, and a deputation of the Union waited on him.

The request of the Union was that this matter be taken up with a view to having legislation enacted for establishing a standard cull of fish.

The Government at that time sympathized with the request of the deputation and promised that something would be done; but that something was never done. For many years afterwards the Union still agitated for an improved cull. At our last convention quite a lot of time was taken up in discussing this matter again, and, so far as my knowledge goes, I feel convinced that the fishermen of the country are prepared now to have legislation enacted that would provide for an improved cure of fish.

The one great drawback to the cure of fish has been the selling of fish talqual, which means that the man who has good fish to sell gets no more for it than the man who has No. 2 inferior fish to sell. The result has been taken by the man who would make good fish because he felt that he was not rewarded for the extra care and labor that was involved in turning out a No. 1 article.

The further result has been that year after year the cure has grown worse and worse and fishermen have taken less interest and become more indifferent as to whether they made fish good or not. Talqual fish is good and bad mixed together. We want, therefore, an improved cure; we want to encourage our men to make better fish, and we consider that the proper way to do it would be through rules and regulations. One of those regulations will, no doubt, be the fixing of the prices between the different qualities. In years past when fish was culled Merchantable and Madeira there was usually about fifty cents of a difference between the qualities, No. 1 or Merchantable was $5 and Madeira $4.50.

The price of fish now is about $10 for No. 1. We consider that when we make regulations we ought to make a difference so large to do the best possible to turn out a No. 1 article. I think certainly that as far as my knowledge and influence go that a price of fish should be fixed as the difference between No. 1 fish and No. 2. Consequently the man who finds that his friend got $2 per quintal more than he did for his fish this year, will make every effort next year to receive the No. 1 price.

Under this bill, a commission will be appointed to establish regulations to show the fishermen what they consider should be done to turn out the special articles for the different foreign markets. These regulations will be published and distributed all over the country and in that way we hope to arouse an interest and enthusiasm among the fishermen and get them to put forth the best that is in them to turn out the different qualities of fish for the different markets.

At present there is considerable wonderment existing with regard to the values of codfish for the coming year. In my opinion, if we can establish an improved cure. that shore fish, salted as No. 1, should fetch $12 per quintal in the market the coming year. That will be $12 for No. 1 and $10 for No. 2. These figures will be better than the prices paid last year when the price started in St. John's at $10.50. So if we get $12 and $10 for Nos. 1 and 2, respectively, or an average of $11, that will mean 50 cents over last year's price.

With regard to Labrador fish. The greatest we will have this year is in keeping Labrador fish within a scope that will not discourage the shoremen, but I feel that if shore fish No. 1 sells at $12 that Labrador No. 1 will sell at $10. There is a wonderful feeling among the shore fisher-

men now over the prices paid for shore and Labrador, because it is so easy to make Labrador fish. It is handled in a much easier way and it takes but a few days to make Labrador fish, but it takes weeks and weeks to make shore. We always find among the shore fishermen that they aren ot getting sufficient rate of value, as compared to Labrador, owing to the Labrador fish rate of value. That is a matter that there is no apparent control over. The majority of the markets only want Labrador fish and will not have shore fish. The supply of Labrador fish the last year or two was somewhat limited. We have not had any surplus supplies of Labrador fish in our markets.

Last year the Eskasoni went to Roumania, Greece, with fifty thousand quintals of Labrador fish and had to remain there a considerable while. If we had had the selling of that cargo we would have secured good results. We marketed all our fish to Greece satisfactorily; and this year I am looking forward to an increased demand for Labrador, especially if put up in the way the markets require it. I am looking for a demand from India; the demand from Greece will still be above what it was, and we hope during the fall to make arrangements to sell to Egypt. There has been some, correspondence with regard to sending a man to Egypt and we are told that there is a possibility of Egypt taking from twenty-five to thirty quintals, which, of course, would be soft Labrador.

Altogether I look forward to a brisk demand for Labrador this fall, as the demand has been considerable and the supply limited. And if men get $10 for No. 1 Labrador, there is going to be quite a feeling among the shoremen, because of the difference of $2 between. Therefore, as this year I am looking forward to a commission appointed to deal with this matter. That commission shall consist of not less than five or more than eleven persons and of which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries shall be chairman.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES: — This Commissione shall have power to control the handling of fish from the time it is caught until it is disposed of to foreign buyers. Rules and regulations will be passed dealing with the manner of catchng, splitting, cleaning, salting and drying, curing and pickling and preparation of fish for sale and export, and also with the culling, selecting, assorting, standardising,branding, etc., etc., with a view to the establishment of the grades in the local and foreign markets and also for ensuring as far as possible a suitable article of a proper grade for the several markets. This commission will be a very important commission and will have power to recommend rules and regulations to the Governor in Council. In this way we nope to get what has been wanting for the last twenty years, viz., some sort of an improved cull, and I am sure that when this commission gets to work, considerable benefits will ensue. It is a matter of great importance to the country, and I am sure the country will accept the bill with interest and appreciation. It is unfortunate that during all those years the country has been without a standardization system and the merchants have bought and sold fish and exported it without let or hindrance. With this standardization, old conditions will disappear. It will be, I hope, the means of encouraging every man to make a number one article and no fish exported from this country in future will be a reflection on our cure and good reputation. When this commission gets to work every package will have

to bear a standard brand and every cargo shall be inspected and a certificate issued and no fish will be allowed to be exported from Newfoundland unless it has been inspected and entitled to a certificate. Under these rules we shall not be able to see again what I saw when I was visiting in Spain and Portugal. In Spain there were fifty thousand quintals of fish which should have been in Italy or Portugal. In Portugal there were fifteen thousand quintals of fish which should have been in Spain. Much of the fish in Spain should have been sent to Oporto, because it was saleable and suitable for Portugal, but not required in Spain. Now if we can get the suitable fish required by the Spanish market, I have no doubt whatever about an increase in the consumption of fish there and I believe it can be increased on hundred thousand quintals per year. The exports to Spain for a year amounts to about three hundred and fifty thousand, and if we can procure the kind and quality of fish Spain requires, there is no reason why we could not sell four hundred and fifty thousand instead of three hundred and fifty thousand. The Spanish fish buyer wants to get the No. 1 quality and there will be an increased demand for the peculiar fish he requires.

Every Newfoundlander refuses to take the No. 2 quality of flour, although it might be $2 cheaper, but will wait for weeks to secure the No. 1 quality rather than take the inferior kind although much cheaper. The same reasoning applies to the Spanish fish buyers. They are prepared to pay a good price. I know of fifty thousand quintals of fish being in Spain and only fetching eighty shillings per quintal, whereas if the proper article were on the market, one hundred shillings would be paid. Even to-day 105/— can be had for No. 1 fish in Spain. Because it was an inferior quality according to the Spanish idea of fish, it sells at twenty-five shillngs less. In Portugal I saw a cargo dscharged and culled and the fish was assorted into three grades and placed in the stores and buyers would come along immediately and purchase the number one prime, which they are prepared to pay good prices for. But of the twenty-five thousand quintals in that store not one hundred quintals was suitable for the No. 1 requirements.

Spain wants the yellow quality, as the while kind is unsaleable, but in Oporto the white is a good seller. We will have to assort the fish for the various markets. It will be no easy job. It will mean a lot of hard work to standardize the fish. The co-operation of all is needed. I hope there will not be any division amongst the people in this matter and all will unite in this national issue. I hope there will be no politics in connection with the standardization of codfish. I am not going to have any party politics in the standardization of codfish on my part. The commission will have full control and select the men along meritorious lines and debar political heelers.

When this bill reaches the committee stage it will be fully thrashed out and I feel sure it will receive the serious consideration of the other side of the House whose ranks contain men of experience in the fishery of this country, in the persons of Sir Michael Cashin and Sir John C. Crosbie, whose life-long experience may be able to recommend some suggestions that will improve the bill. I hope all party politics will be left aside. I hope the standardization of fish will be developed along lines that will encourage the fishermen to turn out the best article, thus ensuring right values and a sure demand abroad.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—We are required to give you a blank cheque to go out and do as you like with. When the bill goes into committee I will have more to say on this point. I am in accord with the bill as a whole. It is a long felt want.

Now, with respect to the manner of catching, splitting, and preparing fish for exportation, just what do you mean by the manner of catching and the manner of splitting? All young men who split fish have to learn and you are going to have some bad ones. There will be many obstacles in your way in carrying out this measure. But I am glad to hear from the hon. minister that there is going to be no politics in this.

There will be lots of hangers on, looking for jobs, and many of them would not be fitted for the work. The first requirement is competent men. I don't think the hon. gentleman will have any opposition from this side of the House on this measure. It is a long felt want; but I think he should give up the names of the commission, and what rules will be laid down. We do not think that we ought to give him a blank cheque and allow him to fill in as he sees fit. I can assure the hon. minister the full support of this side of the House on this measure.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the hon. member of Marine and Fisheries, the bill entitled "An Act to provide for the better obtaining of information respecting the Codfishery" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole House on to-morrow.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—The conditions of this bill place a certain responsibility on the owners of schooners coming from Labrador, the Banks, St. Barbe and Straits of Belle Isle. It requires them to get in communication with the Marine and Fisheries Department from the nearest telegraph office, and wire the information as to the kind of fish he has and the quantity. This he is supposed to do within 48 hours. It is to be given to the trade, as we will allow the trade to know the individual catches of fish brought from Belle Isle the Banks and other places. It also requires the fish exporters to report what quantity of fish of different grades he has in store every two weeks.

This year we tried to get this information, and while some merchants have been glad to give the information, others have refused. This will give us an idea of the supply of fish for the different markets. It is to be confidential information, the trade wil lonly know the total qualities of each grade, but no one will know what stocks each firm carries. This is very necessary if we are going to conduct the business on a sound financial basis. It does not entail any hardship on any person. It will cost the fishermen nothing; the messages will be sent collect to my office. We will then know the quantity of the various qualities of our total catch, and there will be less speculating.

Next year we may be able to provide accurate information respecting the shore fishery, as it is probable that by that time we will have the country set out into sections under the supervision of inspectors who will carry out the rules respecting local cull.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—I wish to say that I also agree with this bill. It is most unbusiness-like that we cannot go into the department and get the information regarding the total catch of fish. It can be done in other countries.

There is no reason why a vessel coming from the Labrador, or any other place, could not report to the nearest customs officer. But that is only a matter of detail. It is very un-

business-like to go along through the summer months not to be able to find out the amount of the total catch. I don't believe it is possible to find out now the total amount of fish caught during the last fiscal year.

The amount of fine, I think, is too heavy. The offence of giving a wrong report is not a criminal matter. You will have no trouble with the fish coming from the Labrador, Grand Bank, and these places. But St. John's and the places around St. John's are going to give considerable trouble.

MR. SCAMMELL — Mr. Speaker, just a word or two in reference to this bill. I may say that I am heartily in accord with it, but I should like to ask the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries one or two questions that have suggested themselves to me while reading this bill. The necessary provision is made for information respecting the Labrador and Straits fishery, but what I want to ask the minister is, how he proposes to get the information with regard to the shore fishery. The sub-collectors in many places are very careless in performing their duties in regard to this matter. I have in mind now the case of my own home of Change Islands.

During the summer I frequently take up the papers and read fishery reports telegraphed in from some of the larger centres around the Island, but Change Islands never appears in the list, and as we catch our fair share of all the fish that is going, I think it only right that we should get our due amount of prominence and praise. I have no doubt that once sub-collectors find it is their duty under this act to telegraph the information they will discharge their duties in this respect.

There is one other matter I should like to refer to. It is perhaps a lesser detail than the one I referred to before, and it is this: I should like to know whether the masters of vessels arriving from the Labrador and the Straits are to telegraph their report at their own expense or at the expense of the depa rment.

MR. MacDONNELL.—Mr. Speaker the two points taken by the hon. member for St. Barbe are the very ones I was about to touch on, and I believe that a few suggestions on this bill would not be amiss. I know, sir, there are many men in this House, many members of the Upper House and many men amongst the public who do not believe that the law of supply and demand has ceased to be responsible for the regulation of the prices of commodities. These are men of intelligence and of superior knowledge and consequently they are men by whom the matter of publishing our codfish catch will not be favorably received. It would that we would be giving the very information to outsiders that they want. Italy will know just how much we have to sell them and they will regulate their prices acordingly. Grece, Spain, Portugal, Brazil and all the other countries will know what we have to give them and they will do the same thing. The principle is vicious and if carried out is bound to be harmful.

The Hon. Minister himself, than whom it is impossible to find a better man where the fishermen's interests are concerned, knows very well that we should not give the outside the benefit of knowing our catch. It is a principle that on mature consideration I believe no right thinking man either in this House or outside of it would subscribe to.

In this matter you must remember that we are up against the theory that Spain, Portugal and other fish buying countries will bid for our product according to what they know we have to offer them, and while it is desirable

and even necessary that the Minister should know the catch from week to week, this information should not be published for the benefit of others.

I am sorry, sir, that a man who has displayed the intention of, and the capability to protect the interests of the fishermen should find himself in the position in which the hon. minister is now placed; and that some other member of the F. P. U. is not its president, so that the minister would be left free to deal with such matters as this as one independent of any influences, for he is a benefit to the country even if he was never backed by any particular section or party, because of his intelligence and ability.

I wish sir, that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries could come in here as an independent party, as connected with no concern or corporation and there would be no man even on the other side of the House give him stronger support than I would. As it is now, he comes in here on the one hand wishing to advance the interests of the fishermen and on the other hand bound by this act to publish information which would be most harmful to these same interests. I am sorry, sir, that again within 24 hours we find the Hon. Minister here in a dual capacity, for it is a position in which no man can justify himself.

With regard to the other parts of this bill I am in perfect accord, but I cannot for a moment agree with the idea of scattering broadcast this information of every quintal of fish we have to dispose of. No man or combination of men can make me believe that prices are not governed by the law of supply and demand the more perishable the commodity in question the stronger does this apply.

Now sir, if we accept this theory of supply and demand then I suggest and emphatically place myself on record as the one who sugges it, that we cannot give information to the enemy. Let the buyer be governed by his needs and the needs of his customers, and by what he feels that he needs, and let that be the only criterion.

Don't you see, Mr. Speaker, if we had 100,000 qtls. last year and we told them that we had 150,000 qtls. this year, we would only get three fourths of the price. We dare not do it, and I, sir, and you, sir, and everyone else in this House owe it to the people of this country to tell the truth, but if necessary, separately, individually or collectively, we owe it to them to put up a bluff and let the world outside think that we have more fish than we have got. I ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I believe that it is not his intention to publish this information for the beneft of the people of Greece or Spain or Italy, so that they may know the total of our catch for a day or a week or a month or a year.

I am a firm believer in the principle that the more perishable an article the more necessary it is as an article of food. On general principles, sir, I object to this bill and I know there is no man in this House more willing to listen to the objections laid before the house by your humble servant than the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

He proved that when the House was in committee last night on the shipbuilding bill, which he knew was subsequently to become an act. He knew the fine points and the real points as well as the weak points of that bill. I think I shall never forget it for a man holding such a position. He said in effect that such and such a thing is right and that such and such is not, and that certain men will get the benefit of it, but because I introduce it I cannot take chances because of people who will use it in future against me.

That was the tenor of his utterances, irrespective of party or irrespective of obligations. I think, Sir, that that is the biggest thing ever done in this House. I am sorry personally, and I am sorry from a party standpoint that it happened. I think it is unfair and most unjust to have any man placed in the dual capacity that the hon. minister was and to have him adopt a course of action that he never anticipated.

While recognizing the bona fide of the hon. minister, I think his attitude in this matter is most unfair. I know the hon. mnisted is big enough to take the consequences of other men's faults and advice, but I submit for the consideration of this House and for those hon. gentlemen who have greater reason than I to remember, that this is the second time within twenty-four hours that the hon. minister has come into this House and taken on his own shoulders this time to prevent, and absolutely prevent buyers from being penalized and from ultimately penalizing himself. He has taken upon his shoulders again that which he did not anticipate. I think it is unfair for a man to whom the whole country, north, south, east and west looks, and with such a brilliant future ahead of him, to take such a course. The whole object is that the hon. minister is big-hearted enough, broad-minded enough and self-sacrificing enough to take upon himself the responsibilities and consequences of a bill which maw materially affect the price of fish for the next ten years.

It is because of that that I draw the attention of the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to my suggestion as to whether or not it would be to our advantage to let the foreign markets and foreign buyers know from day to day the number of quintals of fish that we catch in this country. To my mind it is courtesy miscarried to give them what knowledge, which is beyond ourselves, of what the fishermen have to produce; a knowledge that might influence them in getting at a lower price the fish that we place in the continent of Europe and the market in Brazil. Apologizing for the time that I have taken up, I justify myself by the sincere wishes that I have taken up, I justify myself by the sincere wishes that I have in bringing this matter before the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries and father of this bill, and consider the consequences of making the men that want to buy our fish conversant with our catch daily. I am sure that the minister is a big man with regard to organization, and I have sufficient belief in his bigness that he will exercise his ability and intelligence in the direction that I have referred to. I am of the opinion that fishermen in this country should have to furnish information to any individual or company, no matter how estimable or how desirable, in contradistinction to his own interests; and the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is connected with exporting companies, should not have information furnished him to supply to foreign buyers as soon as he gets it. We dare not put on our statute books an act that gives the benefits to a man that comes into this House in a dual capacity. I submit, Sir, that there is no man in this House or in this country who is a more sincere believer in the theory that I am.

In four short years we shall have to return to our constituents and justify our conduct in this House where as those gentlemen in the Upper Assembly have no constituents to return to and explain what they done, and if they made a law they made it for them selves. I wish to state that or at least I submit that a speech in the Upper House has no more consequence and

is not so important as a speech in the Lower House simply because those in the Upper House represent nobody and are therefore liable to no one for what they say or do. We have taken upon ourselves certain duties, heavy burdens have been placed upon our shoulders, we have undertaken each of us burdens of this world all of which the estimable gentlemen of the Upper House do not carry and therefore the statements we make in this Lower Assembly are of much more consequence. I regret having taken the time of this House, but I assure you, Sir, although my statement might not be accepted that it is not my intention to hold up the legislation of this House. But I want to state at the earliest opportunity with reference to this bill (Standardization of Codfish) that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should not give the benefit of his knowledge of the amount of fish caught in this country and other various matters to Italy, Spain, Brazil, Portugal and the other markets. We should not encourage this Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, a man who personally exports codfish, to give to the outside markets information so that they can regulate the demand according to the supply. We have, Sir, a man in dual capacity, a man who isprepared to go to any lengths to benefit the fishermen of this country and this gentleman is in a position to get the advantage of the conditions existing in the foreign markets.

It is true the Department of Marine and Fisheries is an important one but when the honourable minister fulfills his task he ought to resign as he is in a dual capacity; he is not only W. F. Coaker, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, he is also president Coaker of the F.P.U., president Coaker of the Union Shipbuilding Company, President Coaker of the Union Export Company and this is recognized. He is the best man in the position but when he does his work he ought to vacate his position as a minister of the Crown, and go back to the sphere which he occupies better than any other man in the country and give his attention to that industry which demands that this bill come before the House. He represents the fishermen of the country and he will have all the information as to the supply and demand of fish in the foreign market because of his position of Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Of course for years to come we shall not forget his enterprise in bringing this bill before the House and thereby promoting the interest of the fishermen of the country. Last night when the honourable minister introduced a bill for the encouragement of shipbuilding he said he would not take the $900.00 under the act, although he could get it because he knew that the bill was mortally wrong. And I am sure in the same manner he will not take advantage of his present position as Minister of Marine and Fisheries. And I am sure when the honourable minister comes to reply to the criticisms on the bill he will admit that he is in a position to take advantage of his information regarding the number of fish caught and the price of fish and I firmly believe he would be the last man to give away outsiders such information and thereby giving them an opportunity of being able to regulate the supply and demand. I agree with him that re-organization is necessary so as to improve our influence on the foreign market.

No man holding a departmental office should be given information that is going to be beneficial to his private business. Each one of us last fall deprecated the fact that the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries was in a dual position. I take back nothing

that I said last fall. We should not penalize a man who is honestly trying to be of benefit to his country. But that, Mr. Speaker, is the position of the hon. minister. He is being criticized by a lot of people because of his dual position, while he, himself, is working for the best interests of the country. And the minister should give the benefit of that dual position to the people who have made him what he is. I am not a universalist with regard to legislation. We are not taking the weight of the world upon our shoulders. We are here to make laws for our own country, and they dare not criticize the man who is occupying the dual position. I am sorry Sir, that last night he had to sit at that table, and against his own good judgment he had to accept an act which was intended to benefit a few people. We dare not ask him to sit at that table again to-night. It would be a pity, Mr. Speaker, to kill such a man merely because the legislation has not been given sufficient thought. We have rather to save him from himself. I have no respect for members of this House. I have no respect for political parties. I like a man who tries to do something for the benefit of the public. If the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries considered himself and the Fishermen's Protective Union he would not put such legislation upon the statute books. I believe the hon. minister is fair. I do not believe that the president of a large corporation should have this information. He has the information of every merchant and fish exporter in the country, although he is in competition with them, while the information of his own corporation is known only to himself. I believe that the publication of this information would give to the enemy of this country information that would enable him to give his own price for ourf ish. Now, Sir, I don't think we can afford to let the big man on the other side know the total catch of our fish. I have great confidence in the present Minister of Shipping. He is not interested in the export of fish, and he is the man to whom this information should be given. He is a big man and a square enough man to handle this information. He is the man who should direct the ships. The information should not go to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the hon. minister would do well to follow the suggestin that I have made to him. Mr. Speaker, I will no longer take up the time of this House. It is not opportune for the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to place himself upon the altar of ideals. He is too big a man, too valuable a man. I would ask, Sir, that he insist that the information be forwarded not to him, but to the Minister of Shipping. He is a man whom I am ready to vouch for as a square man, honest and ready to give a square deal to every man in the country.

If this information is given it should be given to the Minister of Shipping and not to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and it would take Mr. Coaker out of an awkward position if he introduced an amendment to this effect. The Minister of Shipping is the person to whom the information should rightly be given, because it is he who controls the exportation of our produce and I submit that it is but fair to him and fair to the hon. introducer of this bill who thereby will be saved the criticisms of four years. I say that it is his duty to those who made him what he is that this information should be given to a man who has no dual role, and I hope that those suggestions made in good faith and in an honest desire to make this bill more exponenta of these principles that are in the interests of the people will be

received in the spirit in which they are offered.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—Mr. Speaker, I personally am in full accord with this bill and I think that it is going to be a great advantage to the trade of the country, more paricularly if it is carried out as strictly as it should be, because in that case we will get valuable and reliable information in connection with which we were always more or less in doubt.

By means of this measure we can so regulate our marketing so that when our catch is small we shall at least be able to get good prices. The bill is in accord with my own ideas and my only suggestion is that the law be forcefully carried out and not merely placed on the statute book to be afterwards thrown aside and forgotten.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Justice, the bill entitled "An Act to Incorporate the Women's Patriotic Association of Newfoundland" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole House on to-morrow.

Second reading of bill entitled "An Act to Incorporate the Women's Patriotic Fund and for Other Purposes."

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this bill, I would remind hon. gentlemen that a few days ago a petition was presented asking that the bill be introduced. When I pesented that petition I referred to the splendid work that was performed by the Women's Patriotic Association on behalf of our soldiers and sailors during the war. So successful were their efforts and as a result of their hard work in this connection that the association now finds itself with a balance of about $27,000 on hand which they propose spending for the benefit of the dependents and children of soldiers and sailors who gave their lives in the war.

The most important sections of this bill are 5 and 7, the former of which gives power to the appointed trustees to erect and equip at a cost of $7000 a recreation hut for the use of the sailors and soldiers receiving treatment in the Tuberculosis Hospital, while Section 7 gives them the power to attend to the matter of providing for the education of and otherwise assisting the children of veterans or of men who have lost their lives during the war.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the second reading of this bill because I feel with the hon. the introducer that the efforts of these ladies are worthy of the highest appreciation and support that we can give hem. They have done and are still doing good work and thereby they have earned for themselves the respect and admiration of the whole community. I am glad that they have such a large surplus on hand and I know that with the funds thus at their disposal they will continued their good work in the future.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—When the Hon. the Attorney General presented a petition from the executive of the Women's Patriotic Association of Newfoundland seeking incorporation, it was my privilege to refer to the magnificent work of the women of the association throughout the length and breadth of the colony the appreciation of the government for their self-sacrificing and philanthropic activities. A very great deal was doethrough the channel for the comfort of our boys who were overseas and the consolation of their friends at home. On that occasion I bespoke for the bill the second reading of which has now been moved by the Attorney General a unanimous passage in this chamber, and I appreciate very much the courtesy of the

leader of the Opposition in accepting the suggestion which I then made and now seconding the motion for the second reading of the bill. The ladies of the association have substantial funds and propose to continue their activities in the interests of the returned soldiers and sailors. I am sure their work is highly appreciated and the country is glad that they have decided to become incorporated as a philanthropic body and carry on in peace philanthropic work similar to that which they so successfully undertook in times of war.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 172 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Survey of Foreign-going and Labrador vessels" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole House on tomorrow.

Second reading of bill "Of the Survey of Foreign-Going and Labrador Vessels."

HON. MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS:—Mr. Speaker, something over a year ago I was at Twillingate when this very matter was discussed at a largely attended meeting of the fishermen and sea-faring classes. The feeling was running strong at that time as regards loss of life on account of what they believed to be overloaded and unfit and unseaworthy vessels. A man in his motor boat could touch the top of a jibboom of a "floating coffin" that was loaded with fish there ready to sail across the ocean. They realised that something should be done and when I came to St. John's last spring. I brought this matter before some members of the government at that time, but for some reason or other it was not taken up. During our campaign around the district last fall I met a man who was mate on a new vessel that was abandoned in mid-ocean on her maiden voyage. He told me that the first gale of wind that they had after leaving St. John's they could not hear themselves talk in the forecastle because of the noise of the timbers. I said this must have been a bady constructed vessel. I was surprised that the vessel could leave St. John's for the market. Eventually she reached accross and discharged her cargo and loaded a cargo of salt, which he said ought not to have been put in her. She met heavy weather and the crew had to battle for their lives for days and days. Eventually the men were taken off by a Norwegian steamer and just barely escaped with their lives, after being dragged through the water with a sixty foot manilla rope. Now, Sir, these things should never happen. She should not have been allowed to sail from St. John's for a foreign port. This kind of thing will be prevented from happening by the enforcement of this bill, which, therefore, I will support.

MR. FOX.—Mr. Speaker, might I ask the hon. minister of marine and fisheries why he would notapply this to all sea-going vessels instead of all foreign vessels. You will notice under the merchants shipping act a distinction drawn between sea-going vessels and foreign going vessels. The latter is a broader term. If we are going to allow these provisions to pass why not apply them to every type of vessel. As to the spirit of the act, I will have something to say when we go into committee.

HON. MIN. MARINE & FISHERIES —Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the hon. member that there is some difference. You cannot permit vessels not fit to go across at Atlantic to engage in the coasting trade of the country. In any case the

coasting vessels will be under survey and we will make provision for all these things. We ought not to be so strict on coasting vessels. Some vessels that were on foreign going voyages during the past few years would do splendid coasing service. At the present time we have splendid coasting vesels on the west coast that are utterly unfit for sea voyages.,tho they are strong enough and good enough to suit local conditions.

I feel sure that when we go into committee that we will have a bill to meet the aproval of all.

HON. MIN. MARINE & FISHERIES —Mr. Speaker. In oving second reading of this bill. I do not intend to refer to it at any length. I merely wish to say that the idea of the bill is to provide that every vessel before loading here for a foreign port must undergo a thorough survey. This is to apply to outside vessels coming here as well as to our local built vessels. If a vessel is chartered outside to take a freight from here and does not come up to the requirements of our schedule B then she shall not be allowed to load. If a vessel purchased outside the Colony by a local firm does not met these requirements we shall allow them to use her for a year or so as to give them a chance to dispose of heragain. Of course if vessels coming in here have a certificate from Lloyds equal to our schedule B we shall recognize that certificate.

HON. MIN. MARINE & FISHERIES —There are many vessels supposed to be good that when used for carrying fish damage the cargo owing to leaky decks. We had a vessel chartered for Oporto last year, just off the slips, and on arrival there it was found that $8,000 worth of fish was damaked owing to water having leaked through the decks. If the ships are not up to schedule B of our shipbuilding act, we will allow them to be used for a certain time, after which they will not be allowed to be used in the trade of the country. Section 7 of this bill provides ample protection for this. It reads as follows: 'Any vessel owned in Newfoundland or elsewhere, which shall not be qualified as set forth in Section 3 of this act, shall on the first occasion on which she shall be in a port in this colony after the passing of this act, be submitted for survey; and unless she shall be found to be constructed and fastened in a manner as least as good as that required by Section 3 of this act she shall not receive a certificate of seaworthiness; provided, however, that of it shall be reported by the surveyer that such a vessel is in his opinion fit to continue in the North Atlantic trade for a short period, the minister of marine and fisheries may issue a special order to Lloyds surveyor or local surveyor, empowering him or his deputy to grant such vessel certificates, of the vessel be otherwise in accordance with the provisions of this act, for a period of not more than twelve months from the date of such survey."

Many ships have been allowed to leave our shores for trans-Atlantic voyages in an unseaworthy condition. Two vessels to my knowledge left Twillingate during 1917 that were overloaded and they were lost with twelve valuable lives.

Another thing which is provided for in this act is the deck line. All our vessels must in future carry this mark. It may not be possible to establish this the same as under the Imperial Board of Trade act.

It will be difficult to fix the mark on our newfoundland vessels, as most of our ships are sheared differently from the English built vessels, and the English act strictly applied might prevent ships from taking 500 quintals that they are well able to

carry, and power will be given to the governor-in-council to depart from the imperial act when dealing with our peculiarly sheared vessels. Half of the vessels crossing the Atlantic jettison part of their cargo and the insurance limit has reached 6½ per cent. on cargoes. An additional 1 per cent. had to be put on by Lloyds this season.

There are other objections as well that are necessary to be removed if we are to lessen the high rate of insurance. The men in command are not as good at seamanship as they ought to be, and there are many good men who have not certificates of service and who should be given a chance to secure them. I think the Board of Trade are endeavouring to secure certificates for some of the best men and a bill may be introduced dealing with this feature of the trouble before the house closes.

Something must be done to protect the honest shippers saginst having to pay such high rates of insurance caused entirely by losses of vessels that are unfit for the Atlantic service, because of unseaworthy vessels being permitted to engage in the business. Freight by steamer is far cheaper than freight by schooner, and if we don't cut down the vessel rate of insurance, steamers will replace the sailing vessels. About $1,300,000 was paid the past season fish insurance by sailing vessels. If we cut down the rate 2 per cent. we would save $435,000 to the fish shippers of this country who shipped in vessels. Therefore a rigid inspection of vessels to cut down insurance rate is absolutely necessary for all concerned in the fiheries of the Colony.

I feel sure the whole House will unanimously accept this bill, as it is a matter we can all agree on. The Hon. Sir John Crosbie has had a great deal of experience in matters of this kind and anything he may suggest for the improvement of the bill, I will be quite willing to consider. The shipowners want legislation such as this and I am sure the insurance companies will welcome it quite as eagerly. It will mean a saving of about 35c. per quintal if we reduce the rate 2 per cent.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—Do I understand that American or French or Canadian ships carrying Lloyd's certificate will be exempted.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—Yes, any ship carrying a certificate of seaworthiness will be exempted.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—That's the point I wanted to know. I appreciate your position, but the surveyor may go and examine her and may send her across but she might damage your fish all the same. But the bill appeals to me more or less; there may be one or two exceptions. I do not believe we would be able to continue sending vessels across as we have been doing, but during the war we couldn't get good vessels and we had to take what we got.

I am more or less convinced that the day of sailing vessels is passing by. I know that I am safe in saying without being egotistical that I'll take off my hat to no man in regard to marine insurance.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 11 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series), entitled 'Of the Department of Marine and Fisheries'," was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole House on to-morrow.

Second reading of bill "Of the Department of Marine & Fisheries."

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—Mr. Speaker, the object of this bill is that we will have two boards now instead of one. We are thinking about getting a large board of about fifteen men, among them will

include men who have had experience in connection with the herring fishery.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I now table correspondence asked for yesterday by Mr. Bennett in connection with Mr. MacKenzie of London. As certain members of the Opposition and Opposition press were inclined recently to attack me personally because of a stenographic inaccuracy in the copy of a letter tabled by my department some days ago, I would observe in this case that I did not personally type these copies, nor did I personally compare them with the originals.

The papers have been sent to me here for tabling by one of the senior clerks of my department, and I consequently take it for granted now, as I did in the previous case, that the copies are typographically correct. If my hon. friend desires to see the original documents and compare them with this typewritten copy he may no so upon calling upon the Deputy Colonial Secretary, Mr. Arthur Mews, C.M.G.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, May 7th, 1920.

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

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from a number of trapmasters of Caplin Bay asking that trap berths be drawn for in the future. I may say that this is the fairest way to decide the ownership of trap berths. It has been known in the past that several fishermen, after a season was over, put out an old trap or a part of a trap so as they held it all winter; consequently there was considerable lot of damage done to moorings. This petition is unanimously signed by the fishermen of Caplin Bay. I hope that the Marine and Fisheries Department will deal with this matter this season and put this trap berth question under the new rules and regulations.

MR. FOX:—With the courtesy of the Houes. I hand in a petition from the residents of Bell Island, the prayer of which is a special grant of three hundred dollars to be expended on a road going from ——— Pond to Freshwater in the west end of Bell Island, a distance of two and a half miles. It is signed by a large number of residents and I feel sure that it will receive the consideration it merits from the department to which I ask that it be referred.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition presented by my colleagues. There is no council over there now and I believe a deputation of the residents are going to call on the Prime Minister to see what can be done by the government to remedy the existing conditions on the Island.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I beg to present a petition from the residents of Seal Cove, Fortune Bay. They ask for a sum of money to repair the breakwater and also ask for the dredge to be sent there. Although presenting it to the House of Assembly I may say that the matter is already having the attention of the government.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—In reply to Mr. Sullivan's question I may say that the information is being prepared.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—In reply to Mr. Sullivan's question I may say that the matter is being considered.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—I wish to remind the Minister of Finance that

he has not answered the question of mine in reference to the Commercial Cable Co.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—In reference to that portion of the remarks of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition referring to the Port aux Basque cable, I would say that the whole matter of the relationships of the Commercial Cable Co., Anglo-American Telegraph Co., and Marconi Company with the government have for some time past been under the consideration of council.

THE HON. MIN. OF FINANCE:—I have asked the heads of the department for the information requested but as far as they are concerned they do not know anything about the matter. I may ask the Leader of the Opposition that if he has any information in his possession he may let us know about it and we will take steps to get the information re Commercial Cable Company.

Classes to train courting couples are suggested by the Vicar of Mansfield, England.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—The Deputy Minister of Finance ought to know about the payments made by the Commercial Cable Company for the last few years. The Company lost the case taken by the government against them and then they appealed on the other side.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I may say that as far as the appeal before the Privy Council by the Commercial Cable Company is concerned which involved the sum of about one hundred and twelve thousand dollars that has been won. But I don't know of anything that has taken place before I assumed office and I do not know whether this is an action the government took against the company for taxes or not. Anyway the sum of one hundred and twelve thousand dollars is due still.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—I will take this opportunity of congratulating the government on winning this case but I think really the congratulations is due the late government. Mr. Morine was the solicitor at the time, when the company appealed. The Anglo-American Co. withheld payments of taxes for four years but as soon as they heard the Commercial Company lost their case they immediately paid the arrears of taxes. They amounted to 94 thousand dollars. Before closing this matter I would like to know whether the government decided upon anything with the Commercial Cable Company about the connection between Port aux Basques and Sydney.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Did you get that amount from the Minister of Finance?

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE:—I have asked for the information from the heads of the department but as far as they are concerned they have no information.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—The Deputy Minister collected the taxes at the rate of four thousand dollars per cable and it is only a small matter. He ought to have a record of it.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE:—I will look for it in the morning.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Before passing that section I would like to know the intention of the section, Section 3. I would like if the minister in charge would outline in a general manner the programme for the future.

Mr. Sullivan asked the Hon. Minister of Finance & Customs to lay on the tbale of this House a statement showing the amount of duty paid by the Anglo Newfoundland Development Co., Ltd., since 1905 to January 31, 1919, and in particular the amounts of duty paid in 1910, 1911, 1912, 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918 and 1919.

Mr. Sullivan asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary if the Government

have made any representation to the Red Cross Steamship Company, against the increasing of the freight rates on that line of 20 per cent to and from New York.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider the bill entitled, "An Act to provide for the Standardization of Codsh."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of committee.

Second reading of Bill "An Act to provide for the Standardization of Fish."

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few remarks regarding this Bill. It is generally conceded that the cure of Newfoundland Fish is not as good as it might be, and for many years the Fishermen's Union has been discussing the advisability of seeking legislative enactment with regard to the improvement of the cure of our fish. In 1909 at the first Convention of the F.P.U. a Memorial was prepared respecting the standardization of fish. That Memorial was presented to Sir Edward Morris at that time Prime Minister, and a deputation of the Union waited on him. The request of the Union was that this matter be taken up with a view to having legislation enacted for establishing a standard cull of fish. The Government at that time sympathized with the request of the deputation and promised that something would be done; but there the matter ended. For many years afterwards the Union continued its agitation for an improved cull. At our last Convention quite a lot of time was taken up in discussing this matter again, and, so far as my knowledge goes, I feel convinced that the fishermen of the country are prepared now to have legislation enacted that would provide for an improved cure of fish. The one great drawback to the cure of fish has been the selling of fish Talqual, which means that the man who has good fish to sell gets no more for it than the man who has No. 2 inferior fish to sell. The result has been that very little care has been taken by the man who would make good fish because he felt that he was not rewarded for the extra care and labour that was involved in turning out a No. 1 article.

The further result has been that year after year the cure has grown worse and worse and fishermen have taken less interest and become more indifferent as to whether they made fish good or not. Talqual fish is good and bad mixed together, and at its introduction began the indifference to cure. We want, therefore, an improved cure; we want to encourage our men to make better fish and we consider that the proper way to do it would be through rules and regulations, in which No. 1 fish sold much higher in value than No. 2. One of those regulations will, no doubt, be the

fixing of the prices between the different qualities. In years past when fish was culled as Merchantable and Madeira there was usually about fifty cents of a difference between the qualities. No. 1 or Merchantable was say $5.00 while Madeira was $4.50. The price of fish now is about $10.00 for No. 1. We consider that when we made regulations we ought to make the difference so large to do the best possible to turn out a No. 1 article. As far as my knowledge goes, Ithink that a price of $2.00 should be fixed as the difference between No. 1 fish and No. 2. Consequently the man who finds that his friend got $2.00 per quintal more than he did for his fish this year, will make every effort next year to receive the No. 1 price. Under this Bill, a Commission will be appointed to establish regulations to show the fishermen what they consider should be done to turn out the special cures for the different foreign markets. These regulations will be published and distributed all over the country and in that way we hope to arouse an interest and enthusiasm among the fishermen and get them to put forth the best that is in them to turn out the different qualities of fish for the different markets. At present there is considerable depression existing with regard to the value of codfish for the coming year. In my opinion, if we can establish an improved cure, No. 1 Shore should fetch $12 per quintal in the local market the coming year. That will be $12 for No. 1 and $10 for No. 2. These figures will be better than the prices paid last year, when the price started in St. John's at $10.50 Talqual. So if we get $12 and $10 for Nos. 1 and 2, each half and half respectively, or an average of $11, that will mean 50c. over last year's price.

With regard to Labrador fish. The greatest care we will have this year is in keeping Labrador fish within a scope that will not discourage the shoremen, but I feel that if No. 1 Shore Fish sells at $12 that Labrador No. 1 will sell at $10 improved cure, while No. 2 will be say $8 and $9. There is a wonderful feeling among the shore fishermen now over the prices paid for Shore and Labrador, because it is so easy to make Labrador fish, and so difficult to make Shore. Labrador is handled in a much easier way and it takes but a few days to make it, while it takes weeks to make shore. We always find among the shore fishermen an objection that they are not getting sufficient relative value as compared to Labrador. That is a matter that there is no apparent control over. Some markets only want Labrador fish and will not have shore fish. The supply of Labrador fish the last year or two has been somewhat limited. We have not any surplus supplies of

Labrador fish in the markets the past season. Last year we marketed all our fish to Greece satisfactorily; and this year I am looking forward to an increased demand for Labrador, especially if cured as the markets require it. I am looking for a demand from Egypt. The demand from Greece will still be as good as last year, and we hope that during the Fall, we will be able to make arrangements to sell to Egypt. There has been some correspondence with regard to sending a man to Egypt and we are told that there is a possibility of Egypt taking from twenty-five to thirty thousand quintals, which of course would be soft Labrador. Altogether I look forward to a brisk demand for Labrador this fall, as the demand will be considerable and the supply limited. And if men get $10 for No. 1 Labrador, those who secure fair voyages will reap considerable reward. Therefore, as this Bill provides, there shall be a Commission appointed to deal with the matter. That Commission should consist of not less than five or more than eleven persons, of which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries shall be Chairman.

This Commission shall have power to control the handling of fish from the time it is caught until it is disposed of to foreign buyers. Rules and regulations will be passed dealing with the manner of catching, splitting, cleaning, salting and drying, curing and pickling and preparation of fish for sale and export; and also with the culling, selecting, assorting, standardizing, branding, etc., etc., with a view to the establishment of the grades in the local and foreign markets and also for ensuring as far as possible a suitable article of a proper grade for the several markets. This Commission will be a very important Commission and will have power to recommend rules and regulations to the Governor-in-Council and in this way we hope to get what has been wanting for the last twenty years, viz.: some sort of an improved cull, and I am sure that when this Commission gets to work, considerable benefit will ensue. It is a matter of great importance to the country, and I am sure the country will accept the Bill with interest and appreciation. It is unfortunate that during all those years the country has been without a standardization system and the merchants have bought and sold fish and exported it without let or hindrance. With this means of encouraging every man to make a number one article no fish exported from this country in future will be a reflection on our cure and good reputation. When this Commission gets to work every package will have to bear a standard brand and every cargo shall be inspected and a certificate issued and no fish will be allowed to be exported from Newfoundland unless it has been inspected and entitled to a certificate. Under these rules we shall not be able to see again what I saw when I

was visiting Spain and Portugal. In Spain there were fifty thousand quintals of fish which should have been in Italy or Portugal. In Portugal there were fifteen thousand quintals of fish which should have been in Spain. Much of the fish in Spain should have been sent to Oporto, because it was saleable and suitable for Portugal, but not required in Spain. Now if we can get the suitable fish required by the Spanish market, I have no doubt whatever about an increase in the consumption of fish there and I believe it can be increased one hundred thousand quintals per year. The exports to Spain for a year amount to about 350,000 quintals and if we can procure fifty thousand and if we can procure the kind and quality of fish Spain requires, there is no reason why we could not sell four hundred and fifty thousand instead of three hundred and fifty thousand. The Spanish fish buyer wants to get the No. 1 quality and there will be an increased demand for the peculiar fish he requires.

Every Newfoundlander refuses to take No. 2 quality of flour, altho' it might be $2 cheaper, but will wait to secure the No. 1 quality rather than take the inferior kind although much cheaper. The same reasoning applies to the Spanish fish buyers. They are prepared to pay a good price. I know of fifty thousand quintals of fish being in Spain and only fetching eighty shillings per quintal, whereas if the proper article were on the market, one hundred shillings would be paid. Even today 105/— can be had for No. 1 fish in Spain. Because it was an inferior quality according to the Spanish idea of fish, it sells at 25 shillings less. In Portugal I saw a cargo discharged and culled and the fish was assorted into three grades and placed in the stores and buyers would come along immediately and purchase the number one prime, which they are prepared to pay good prices for. But of the twenty-five thousand quintals in that store not one hundred quintals was suitable for the No. 1 requirements. Spain wants the yellow quality, as the white kind is unsaleable ,but in Oporto the white is a good seller. We will have to assort the fish for the various markets. It will be no easy job. It will mean a lot of hard work to standardize the fish. The co-operation of all concerned is needed. I hope there wil not be any division amongst the people in this matter and all will unite in this national issue. I hope there will be no politics in connection with the standardization of codfish. I am not going to have any party politics in the standardization of codfish on my part. The Commission will have full control and select the men along meritorious lines and debar political heelers. When this Bill reaches the Committee Stage it will be fully thrashed out and I feel sure it will receive the serious consideration of the other side of the House whose ranks contain men of experience in the fishery of this country in the persons of Sir Michael Cashin

and Sir John C. Crosbie, whose life-long experience may be able to recommend some suggestions that will improve the Bill. I hope all party politics will be left aside. I hope the standardization of fish will be developed along lines that will encourage the fishermen to turn out the best article, thus ensuring right values and a sure demand abroad.

I might say it is the intention of that section to give the Commission power to deal with the cure of fish from the time it is caught until it is put on board the ship for export. This section gives them their power to do so. They may not use those powers. For instance it may not be necessary to make rules and regulations as to how fish is to be caught, but it is well to have such powers. The manner and mode of catching fish is dealt with by the Fishery Board. In Norway they have a certain system, and as soon as the fish is taken out of the water there is a certain vein cut in the throat, the fish is bled, and that is why it is white. Now that could not be done here. The conditions that prevail in Norway are quite different from here, but it is just as well to give the Commission authority in case that in the future they may want to make necessary rules and regulations. They have the authority here to make rules and regulations to be approved of by the Governor-in-Council before becoming law. The whole system depends upon the men who comprise the Commission. We must have good enterprising, reliable, experienced men. If we get a good Commission, three parts of the trouble will end. It may not be easy to get the fishermen to follow out the instructions, but we will make the trial. We do not mean to have men going around compelling them to do this and that, but it is the intention to scatter literature broadcast and advise them what to do. It is absolutely necessary that when fish is split to drop it into a tub of water and wash all the blood and gurry off before salting. This is very important in curing fish; consequently it may be necessary to deal with that aspect of curing, if reasonable persuasion and advice are not effective. Therefore we give the Commission power to deal with cleaning and wasting.

Then there is the salting of fish; everybody knows what that means. There are certain kinds of salt that should not come into this country. It is not fit for use, and good fish cannot be obtained as long as it is used. Also, the cure of fish must determine the kind of salt used. Cadiz salt everybody knows is good salt for shore fish. Santa Pola the most suitable salt for Labrador and it may be necessary in the future to prevent the use only of such salt for salting Labrador fish. There might be regulations made as time goes by with respect to this. In the same way the drying of fish must be taken up. The day is coming when we will probably have to establish driers in every important fishing settlement.

Everybody knows of the conditions that exist at the present time in the drying of fish. The late curing of fish means very often that the fish has to be held over all the winter, and exported in the following spring or summer, and at a loss in price. That is the condition which existed the past year. Sometime we will have to get artificial driers. When we get properly started in the Fisheries Department and a competent man in charge as Superintendent, we will probably have this matter experimented on and arrive at a solution of this trouble. We will have to try experiments with different driers. I want to have one as cheap as possible. Then there is the matter of cure. As time goes by we shall probably have to make some rules and regulations with respect to the cure of fish. This year the merchant must understand that if he buys poor fish he is not going to export it as good. If we make a difference of say $2.00 in the price if No. 1 and No. 2 fish we will soon get all to turn out a No. 1 quality. But this cannot be done in a year or probably two years. I do not mean by this that we will regulate the price that will be paid the fishermen for his fish. That will be determined by the supply and demand that has been so much discussed. We have to learn by experience and step by step. Then There is the pickling of fish. Fish that goes to Spain must be pickled if it is to fetch the highest price. But there must be only a certain quantity pickled. If there are 350,000 qtls. pickled and only 300,000 needed in Spain, we will have 50,000 qtls. for which we have absolutely no market. Every cargo of fish should be inspected, and the inspector of it should issue a certificate when the cargo is completed, The various sections of this Bill may appear to mean the same thing, but this is not so. There are a lot of matters in connection with fish from the time it is caught till it is exported that have to be provided for, and that is what we are trying to do. Even if fish is loaded improperly it will injure its sale. In taking in fish in the next two or three years we will not be able to make such a great distinction with respect to grades, but we will have a big distinction in the prices as between No. 1 No. 2 and No. 3. There will not be more than three or four qualities. When the local inspectors are provided, the merchant will have no control over the culling of fish. I would like to see the day when the merchant will have nothing to say on their wharves about the culling of fish, when the inspector will not be interfered with either by the merchant or the fishermen.

With respect to the last clause, this is a very important clause. Fully three-fourths of the claims

for bad fish are due to bad dunnageing, damp vessels and leaky decks. I saw vessels discharging with absolutely no dunnage, with nothing on the side of the vessel under the fish. We cannot permit this to continue.

Then there is the matter of the standard of size, conditions of assorting, selecting, etc. All this is put in the Bill because the Board will find out that they must have the powers to deal with such matter as time passes. Fixing the difference in prices is a very important point. That is what I mean by No. 1 and No. 2. I want No. 2 so penalised that every man will be induced to make No. 1. In many cases No. 2 is made because of conditions which the fisherman does not control; but on the other hand, I have seen fish left on the flakes three and four days and nights as a result of utter indifference as to results. We must remedy this condition. Very often the buyers on the other side want to know who the shippers are and from what port a vessel has sailed. If by the Union Trading Company, they say all right, if by Earle & Sons they feel that the quality is all right if from Marystown they go carefully, and ask all kinds of questions. They know that from certain places and from certain shippers they get good fish. The standardization of fish is going to be the salvation of the West Coast shippers, as the same grade of No. 1 will be the same at Grand Bank as at St. John's or North. We cannot expect Bank fish to be as good as Shore fish, but when it is graded it will fetch No. 1 price if No. 1, and if No. 2 it will pass as No. 2, and every buyer will know exactly what is in the cargo.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—This is not a blank cheque, the whole thing rests with the Commission and if you get the right men on that Commission, success will follow. Certainly, if we allow it to be made a political football, we might just as well tear up the Bill now for all the good it is going to do. We cannot allow it to become a political eye-sore, the trouble from which this country has suffered so much in the past.

As we go on with the Bill, some suggestions may be offered, but no matter from which side of the House they come, so long as they are calculated to make the Bill more perfect, I shall be delighted to take advantage of them. The day has come for this Bill, the day has come for us to turn over a new leaf, and I hope the House will approach this measure in the right spirit and solely with a view to doing the greatest good for the country in general.

Second reading of bill entitled "Of the Survey of Foreign-going and Labrador Vessels."

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this bll, I do not intend to refer to t at any great length. I merely wsh to say that the idea of the bill is to provide ttha every vessel before leaving port must undergo a thorough survey. This to to apply to outside vessels coming in here as well as to our local built vessels.

If a vessel is chartered outside to take a freight from here and does not come up to the requirements of our Schedule B, then she wll not be allowed to load If a vessel purchased outside the colony by a local firm does not meet with these requirements we shall allow them to use her for a year so as to give them a chance to dispose of her again. Of course, of vessels coming in here have a certificate from Lloyd's we shall recognize that certificate. The bill also provides for a loading line and will fill a long felt want.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the Hon. Member, I might say that I do not know whether it would be wise to state the names of two practical fishermen, but I can certainly promise him that there will be. The Fish Exporters had a meeting a few days ago and asked me to include five exporters on the Commission and to be elected by the Board of Trade. I objected to such a proposal, because first, it was dictating to us, and next, that five would be half the membership of the Commission. Immediately the impression would be that we were allowing the Board of Trade to dominate us. With regard to the question of the Hon. Member for Placentia, I would inform him that there will be two practical fishermen on the Commission and probably three. In reference to the suggestion of the Hon. Mr. Higgins as to notice to be given, I am prepared to alter that clause, making it imperative that 30 days notice be given, before every occasion when the Rules and Regulations are brought into force.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—I feel with the hon. gentleman, Mr. Chairman, that the time has come for this bill to be introduced for the improvement of our codfishery, but there are one or two alterations I would suggest in regard to the bill now before the repair. In the first place the question of penalty should not be left to the commission by this house of assembly. It is giving a blank cheque to persons of whom we know nothin to go out and do what they please. It is neither fair to us nor to the country.

With regard to the matter of catching fish, I am of the opinion that very little can be done. You cannot compare our fishery with Norway's; they are two entirely different things. For us to attempt to bleed the fish as they are taken into the boat would be attempting the impossible. For instance, take a man going out to his trap in the morning and dipping in 40 or 50 quitals of fish, and you will see how ridiculous it is for us to try and copy Norway in this respect.

As to the matter of salting and pickling fish, I want to point out that here is a fish that has caused considerable trouble, and there is nobody who knows this better than the hon. minister himself. The pickling of fish is done almost exclusively by the bummerman, who catches only a small amount of fish. He has his puncheons, his hogheads, or his barrels as the case may be, but he puts his fish in these, nicely split of you like, but no matter how well it is handled it is not going to be as good as the salt bulk fish. As the scarcity of salt increases, pickled fish will increase, because it only requires half the salt. You wash it out, make it and it is beautiful to look at, but the trouble begins when you put it in bulk. Then it becomes dun and damp and goes through everything that might be with it.

Now if you are going to make rules and regulations and intend to carry them out, you must have a penalty and that is the only way you will deal with the matter of pickled fish. If it is likely to have a detrimental effect on other kinds of fish

it must be stopped altogether even if you sell it in Spain. Take places like Torbay for instance, where half the catch comes from, the bummerman, too, when fish is not plentiful, pickles his fish in many cases. To prevent this you must have a penalty, and right here in this House of assembly is the place to decide upon the penalty.

As far as culling is concerned and the hopes held out that we won't see the same thing happen in the future as happened in the past, I don't agree with the hon. gentleman. I hope I am not taking the gloomy view of it, and I admit that while prices are as they are to-day everything will be all right, but when prices are bad you will find that conditions will go back to where they were in the olden days. When the demand is poor and the merchants are not anxious to buy, it will be found difficult to keep up to these regulations.

I have sold fish where I've had nine or ten qualities where there were really only two or three, but what could you do? The price was low and there was consequently little or no demand. The merchant would go down on the wharf to the culler and say "You are putting Madeira with merchantable or West Indies," and so on, and the man who was selling the fish had to take what he got. Another thing, it is certainly going to be impossible for the commission to grade the price of fish.

As far as northern and western fish is concerned there is no doubt about the fact that the northern fish is the best. Trinity Bay fish is, I believe, the best fish made anywhere in the Island. It is the best place in the country to make fish.

Now with regards to Bank fish which is exported from the west coast, it is next to impossible to make it up to the standard of shore fish. The fish is thrown up on the deck and very often it has to remain there all day, so that between the exposure of the sun and the rolling of the vessel the fish is soft by the time it is split and stowed down, making it extremely difficult, if not altogether impossible to have good fish. Again, when it comes to be landed for making it has to be taken from the vessel, put into a dory from the dory into a ramshorn, from the ramshorn to the water-horse, and from the water-horse to the flake, and then if you get any kind of bad weather how is it possible to have good fish?

Now, in Bonavista Bay, Trinity Bay and along the southern shore, they haven't these conditions to contend with and they should be expected to produce a better article. I would very much like to see a penalty provided at once if we are to make a serious attempt to stop the pickling of fish, and there is no doubt that it must be stopped. It will be a hardship at first, I know but still it is our duty to do all we can for the betterment of the quality of our fish. It is an article of food and the very best care should be exercised in handling it.

Now sir, what does the reference in the bill to weight mean. It dosen't refer to the rock in the box, I suppose?

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES:—At the present time in weighing in fish for Brazil we are not particular enough—and drums are often found to be two or three pounds out. We intend to give the inspector the power to attend to this matter and see that the weight is right when the drums are being packed.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—The answer to that is that whenever you weigh in fish you will weight out one, two, or even three per cent. less, and the same thing applies to drums. You'll

never get them to turn out the same as they are weighed in.

Now sir, as far as the reference made by the hon. minister to driers in concerned, I do not at all agree with him. We will never see many driers in this country and personally I should prefer that we would not. We cannot make as good fish with artificial driers as we do now and many hon. members on the other side know this as well, if not better than I do. Fish fade in this way is not palatable as that dried by the sun and air and that is the reason why our fish is so much more popular in the foreign markets than the product of other countries. Sun and air has much the same effect on fish as the climate has in the maturing of port wine.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would again say that I would like to see this penalty put in the bill.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—With reference to the request of fixing penalties it would be extremely difficule to do so at this time. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is quite willing that a penalty should be provided, but you will see that it is impossible to provide a general penalty in as much as some offences will require heavier penalties. Similar penalties are provided for in breaches of the ordinary regulations. The marine and fisheries department in this case in given power to fix the penalty. It is very hard for us to fix a thing of this sort. If sufficient confidence be placed in the commission to handle this matter, I do not think we would be doing too mucn to grant them the power to provide the penalties. At the present time unless we were in possession of the rules and regulations made by the commission it would be impossible to provide penalties

SIR J. CROSBIE:—What about another bill providing for a fine of $500.00 respecting the codfishery.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Yes, that was provided because you knew what you were going to fine them for. It would be impossible to set up penalties for any particular set of rules and regulations that have not yet been drawn up.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES:—Take the standardization of fish for instance. If a man breaks the rule in connection with the pickling I think that $10.00 would be sufficient as a fine, but if one of the merchants were to commit a grave breach a heavier penalty would certainly be necessary. We should lean more leniently on the fishermen who may be convinced for a small offence. How are you going to provide a general penalty to cover all under these conditions. The point is we want to make the fishermen who commits a breach of the regulations pay probably $10.00 while the merchant who in in a position to break the more necessary regulations pay $10000.00.

MR. HIGGINS:—One thing the commission ought to guard against is the probabilities of providing a heavy general penalty. A specific penalty should be made for each class of offence. I would make a specific fine for pickling but I would seperate that class of offence from getting after the bigger man who is expected to pay more. The point to be gotten over by the commission is the providing of seperate penalties for different offences. Supposing a mixifum general penalty of $-.000 was made law, then it is quite conceivable that some magistrate might fine a fisherman $200 or $250 for a small offence. If you would direct the cofmission to provide a penalty for each class of offence then the fagistrate would not be able to overreach himself in the administration of his office.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:— That just the very point that stopped me when I started to draft penalties. Now I have here drifted a further addition to be put into this bill giving the comfission power to—

'Fix penalties for any specific rule or regulation."

I think the Hon. Member for St. John's East is passing comments upon the paper in question which it does not deserve. There were one or two points raised by the Hon. Member for St. John's East (Mr. Fox). First of all he opposed the advisability of appointing the commission to deal with the standardization of fish.' I think he will recognize that on these technical points in ninety-nine cases out of one hundred the legislature delegates the duty to those who know most about the subject Supposing the House has this bill before it and draws up the rules and regulations for the standardization of cod fish, the only thing I could do was to see that they were legal, they were framed properly and the proper language was used, but I must confess it is a matter about which I know nothing and therefore cannot discuss. And if I made the rules and regulations and sent them around for the approval of the fishermen they might say this is nonsencial who drew these up. Who was he? He was Warren the lawyer. Why should we deal with the technical side of the question where the fisheries are involved and about which most of us know nothing and bring in rules here and ask the House to discuss them. ou or I do not know the first thing about them. It is best to leave them to practical men and this is done not alone in Newfoundland but in every other country. Take the Board of Trade in England. It has several sub-committees to deal with every concievable subject of a technical nature for instance, rules for the safety of miners, rules for quarantining, rules as to the building of ships. The rules about quarantine are dealt with by the public health board. Rules for traffic are made by the police department. Then there is the game and inland fisheries board. This board regulates the catching of salmon and trout and the killing of partridge, when the close season commences and so on. If all these rules had to be made in this house, then the legislature would never get through.

It is better to leave it to those who know most about it. Now with reference to penalties under the act the only penalty the fishermen would be liable to is only a civil one. If he put up what he said is number one quality whereas really it is number two he is the sufferer as he will not get paid for it as No. 1. Now when a fisherman catches his fish he can do what he likes with it. He does not break any rules except public health if he leaves it there to rot. Altho it may not be the fishermen's interest or his neighbors to do so.

Well, for instance, when he catch-- es his fish he does not carry out the rules and cure it in the proper way the penalty will be when he comes to sell it he will not get the price for number one when his quality is only number two. I think everything is clear in the act. The matter comes under the Department of the Marine and Fisheries and the honourable minister is responsible to this house. And I have every confidence in the hon. gentleman and those that will constitute the commission.

MR. FOX—I subscribe to the proposition that we can place confidence in the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to select the commission. I am sure he is sincere in his intentions and he will not allow anything to go wrong that he can help and I endorse

what the Honorable Minister of Justice has stated. But I ask that a select committee be appointed to confer with these gentlemen who will comprise the commission and that the commission will work in conjunction with the select committee and make the rules and regulations before the prorogation of the House. I humbly submit that these rules and regulations be laid before us for our assent and I think the members of the House will view this reasonably, but I do not presume to dictate to the members of the commission on matters of which I have not practical knowledge. I do not believe in appointing to the commission people who are outsides and who are not responsible to the country and give them the whole control. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is only one man out of eleven people. His voice is only one of those on the commission. I ask the House to consider the principles of the Bill and I think we should know the names of those on the commission, and I do not agree with placing in their hands unlimited powers when they are not responsible to the electorate. I think the matter should be completed before the closing of the House.

MR. SULLIVAN—I am very pleased to be able to congratulate the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries in bringing in a measure of the kind contained in this bill. It is a bill which the Progressive Liberal Party can support, and from the tone of the debate upon it I have no doubt that all the members of the Progressive Liberal Party will give this bill their hearty support. It is a progressive measure and it is our policy to stand for anything that stands for progressiveness. I have no doubt that there will be a lot of adversity of opinion on this clause contained in the bill, but as a whole will be easily overcome. I endorse what the honorable Minister said here yesterday when he said that this commission would be formed along non-political lines. I hope that the men selected to compose this commission will be practical men and hope this commission will not be comprised of merchants solely. I trust that the men will be selected as the Minister stated yesterday on merit. If this is done it will have my hearty support and that I am sure of those on this side of the House. I am sure that the great organization of the F. P. U. will watch this measure with a great deal of interest because as the Hon. Minister stated here yesterday this idea was first formulated at the convention of the F. P. U. held in 1909.

Another matter to which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries referred is the question of talqual. I do not blame the fishermen for selling his fish talqual. I blame the merchant. During the last few years the merchants wanted the quantity not the quality, and if a man is assured of first class price for a third rate article he is not going to bother making a good article. But if there is a difference in prices he will soon see that every fisherman will try to put up a first grade food product. I am in accord with Sir John Crosbie, not to penalize the fishermen. The penalty of difference in price should be sufficient respect to the kind of salt used we shauld have scientific tests made and educate the fishermen into using the proper quantity of the different grades. I differ from the member for Port de Grave regarding the pickling of fish. Pickled fish is not the kind that is wanted by the big marketss of the world. I want to say that I am in accord with this bill, and wish to congratulate the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries in introducing it If it is properly car-

ried out it should bring good results and be of great benefit to the country.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Speaker, as a member of this assembly who was for some time engaged in the catching and curing of codfish, I want to add a few words. I want to congratulate the hon. introducer of this bill It will if handled properly, remove many of the obstacles under which the country is now laboring in putting up good fish. The committee which is to be appointed will be composed as to represent every section of the country. I sincerely hope that not only the buyer and the exporter and other monied interests will be represented on this committee. I hope the fishermen will be represented, because the information asked for in this bill can only be furnished by men who have actively engaged in the catching and curing of fish. Large losses have been met by the exporters of fish, principtlly because they have contracted to supply large quantities. I want to consider especially one case. I remember one of my constituents sold 1400 quintals of fish to the agent of a lage exporter doing business here. When the cargo arrived this man who had sold for $14.25 was told that if he would release the agent and the merchant he would get a bigger price. He released them from their contract in all good faith. But when the surveyor was put on and all the talqual taken out it netted him $10.25, a loss of $4.00 per quintal. This thing has been snappening all over the Island because of the talqual system. There should be an incentive to produce a good article, and if the price is paid for a No. 1 article as distinguished from a No. 2 article, the No. 1 article will be obtained. I have seen fish handled in such a way that you would never think that it was meat for consumption. I note that the fishermen will not be penalized this year. This, I think, is a step in the right direction.

Here I want to say once more, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. father of this fill has my entire co-operation in every particular, and I trust that the best results will accue from it. Although I have no doubt been accused of occupying the time of this house solely from the desire to obstruct the proceedings this charge is entirely incorrect. Any time that I have anything to say upon any matter that is before us I shall deem it my privilege and my duty to express my views, and I am going to avail of that privilege whenever it appears to me that it is right and proper in the interest of those whom I represent that I should do so.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr.Speaker, I would like to say that as far as the framer of the bill is concerned there is no intention of penalizing the fishermen. The only penalty he is up against is getting a lower price where he purchases inferior article. There may be a penalty for pickling fish when he should not, but I understand that a certain quantity of fish can be used. But the only penalty is really the penalty of price, which comes into effect in the grading of the fish.

MR. MacDONNELL—Mr. Chairman with reference to the bill now before the House, I have to differ from everybody who has so far spoke on the mat ter either on this side or the other side. It is not that the bill may not be a very estimable one. I am of the belief that it is. I am of the belief that it may work out to the great benefit of our fishing industry; but what I object to is this we in this assembly should be asked to delegate to a body of men of whom we know absolutely nothing the administrative powers which are ours and ours alone. I say

sir, most emphatically, that we have no right whatsoever to delegate to others the powers which the people have given to us. We have no right to give to a number of men we don't know a blank cheque to make what laws they like and inflict what penalties they like regardless of whether these laws may prove to be beneficial or detrimental. It is a lamentable ever sight on the part of the hon. minister that he should think of giving to any commission those powers which belong to this House alone. He has a perfect right to make what rules and regulations he thinks necessary in connection with this bill, but they should be made here, and further, the hon. minister knows that these rules and regulations are to be, and I consider it neither courteous nor fair to the members on this side of the House that he should refuse to tell us what powers are to be vested in this commission and what laws they are to be pemitted to make.

If every other member of this House is prepared to subscribe to a principle of this kind I for one am not. I am going to give to no man, no matter how estimable he may be, that right which I possess as a member of this honourable assembly. The very idea is rediculous. It is all very fine for the hon. minister to talk about good intensions and bona fides. I have no doubt of his good intensions, but he is presuming too far on this House when he permits outsiders to pass laws and penalize our fishermen. I am suprised at hon. members of this House, and more particularly the members on this side, allowing such a thing to go on without voicing the most vigorous protest, and I say again that if there are thirty-five who want to do this thing here is one who will not subscribe to it. If we place ourselves on record as allowing this to go through and a bill came before us to give any member in the cabinet the right to appoint commission with plenoptenitory powers to make laws and regulations, we cannot object to it.

It is regrettable, Mr. Chairman, that an hon. member, because he dares to voice his disapproval of any measure of which he cannot agree, should be accused of obstructing the proceedings. Does this House think that because a man is characterized and tagged as an obstructionist that he is going to be muzzled? This is what is being attemp ted here and some day I shall fix the blame for it on the right shoulders. The mantality of the person who thinks that he can intimidate men by this sort of misrepresentation and abuse is indeed pitiable.

I say again Mr. Chairman that with regard to this bill I want to go on record as emphatically objecting to the principal of giving such powers as are here indicated to a commission, the constitution of which we khow nothing. Why didn't we come in here on the opening day, appoint a commission to carry on the whole business of the country and go home and be done with it? We have heard too much of commissions in this country and seen too little of their work, and to think of any number of men being picked up on the street and given powers as far reaching as these, is too much. Despite the good will of the hon. minister, he has no power once this commission is appointed to control their actions. He gives them the power to do things of which he may not approve and which he would not do himself, but he will be powerless to prevent it. I do not see why he cannot at least give us the names of the proposed commission and some idea of the laws they will make. Of these matters we are absolutely in the dark and yet we are asked to give carte blanche to this unknown bady of men to make laws for and impose penalties upon the people who sent us to this assembly as their representa tives. When the time for this comes I,

at least, shall go on record against the idea that I should band over my part in the making of the legislation of this counry o any man.

Mr. Chairman before this bill goes through I would like to be assured on one or two points. I wonder, when this commission have made their regulations, what would happen if these regulations were to contract with those already on the statute book? When they come into force will they cancel all other regulations in eference to this matter, because if so we cannot take the chance of giving to an unknown body of men the power to revoke existing laws. Unfortunately we we do not know what we are doing; we do not know what the proposed regulations are to be, what penalty will be provided, who are to be the men who will make those regulations, or it they will take procedence over those now on the statute book. I think it is unfortunate that with regard to the bringing about of the necessary reforms we should have to abrogate our authority to others and for this reason all must go against the bill because when you take away that section there there is nothing else in it. The hon. minister has said that the fishermen will not be pentlized this year, but that does not alter the position that it would be alright to appoint a commission of enquiry for the purpose of fond ing out what changes are necessary and the best way to make them but such a commission should not have the power to make regulations.

MR. FOX:—In sections of this act I am in full accord, but I have several objections, however. In the main I thoroughly understand the theory that codfish be standardized. If to-day our markets hove been injured or we have lost our grip we can attribute nothing to it but the fact that we are responsible. We had great opportunities of capturing the best markets of the world and holding them, but we took the advantage of the days that were in dire distress and we sold them fish that we should not have sold them, and we have nobody to blame but ourselves Whe is responsible fo this condition of affairs I am not prepared to say, but as the Hon. Sir John Crosbie had said we cannot blame the fishermen. If a man can come up here to St. John's and sell any quality of fish we cannot blame him for that, and the man who has taken great care to cure his fish has received no encouragement whatever, because the man with the bad fish will secure just as good a price as the man who brings along the good quality

I say that Newfoundland shauld be in the same position to-day that Norway and Sweden and Iceland are holding. They have the best markets of the world because they deliver the best cured fish and it demands the best possible price. Newfoundland fish should be made so as to get those markets and hold them and I am in through accord with this act that our fishery industy be standardized. But I object to the theory that this House should delegate its powes to a body of men for the purpose of carrying out this act. And, in stating this I quote an old motto which sets the whole position as it should be. "Powers which have been delegated to a body should not by them be delegated to others."

I say that we are not doing our duty if we delegate to a commission ir irresponsiblles the powers which have been vested upon us by the people whom we represent. Why should we not prepare the rules and regulations Isn't is just as simple for us to have to select committee and confer with a committee of outport men and prepare these rules and regulations and incorporate them in this act by legislative sanction. I think we are derelict in our duty if we endorse this pinciple of appointing a commission of irresponsibles to drift rules and regulations when we do not even know the

men, and I am sorry fo this country if we allow the government to pass legislation of this character. I object to that theory and I believe the government is making a serious mistake in allowing legislation of this kind to pass this House. What is to prevent the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries appointing a select committee of this House to investigate into this matter and draft rules and regulations and take them into his consideration and let the rights of Newfoundland be protected. What do we know of anyone of this commission? Are they under any obligation to us? Have we any gurentee that they will furnish the country with a set of rules that will conserve the right of Newfoundland

But the idea of deliberately condoning the practice of delegating the powers and obligations of this legislature to a group of men, who are not answerable to this country, is an unpartonable offence aganst all constutional practice. The theory of government of such classes of people that this bill affects is treated in a very light fashion indeed, particularly by the Hon. Mnster of Marine and Fisheries, who is responsible for the carrying out of such a principal. If the hon. member of the government do not realise the principle that they are intoducing, then it is time that they opened their eyes. I must again say that I object to it on theory and on principle.

Another further objection that I have to the bill is that I want to know under what cenction are the rules and regulations to be carried out? What authority has this group of gentlemen to exercise powers that they have no right o no authority to exercise. They start off to make rules and regulations and there is nothing in that act to compel the enforcement of them. I commend that to the law minister of the crown. We are told in the act that the fishermen are to be penalized, but the full penalty is to be placed upon the selling of fish. Would the Hon. Minister of Justice please tell me under what particular section of the act is anybody penalized, and I want to know what will the effect of the act have. We are loading up our statute book with laws of no practical effect and the only effect that I can see that this act is going to have is that it will some day bring be a fee. The Hon. Minister of Justice tells me that it is not the intention to penalize the fisherman, but to encourage him to make good fish in his own interest, and that when he comes to sell badly cured fish he puts himself within the penalizing scope of the act. But I would like to know what section of the act can be enforced, as regards penalty, and what is the use of putting it on the statute book if it cannot be enforced. You are carrying that principle too far and we are likely to have a very practical law library. Another point I would like to refer to is this: Why do we want to limit ourselves to any commission. Why not say in Section 3 that rules and regulations shall be prepared, subject to the approval of the legislature before being put into effect, controlling the manner in which codfish is prepared for sale and transported. I protest emphatically against the transferring of the powers of the legislature to any commission and I would suggest that a select committee of this House be appointed to sit in conjunction with the commission appointed under the bill.

Why limit the effect and scope of the regulations to the improvement? Why not make this act as broad as possible? It cannot hurt it and may do a lot of good. It may avoid friction. It certainly will make the statute very much clearer and leave no room for argument. I understand the idea is not to apply the act to old time methods, but merely for improved methods. Let us suppose to

those gentlemen, who are to prepare the rules and regulations dealing with so-called improved conditions of codfish, that I assuming that I am a fisherman, can produce evidence to show that I have prepared my fish in the good old-fashioned style. They cannot touch me, because there is nothing that I have done is an improvement on the old methods. Why not strike out the words "for the improvement" and say specifically "and the manner in which codfish is prepared and transported." I suggest that to the consideration of the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

I thoroughly endorse the spirit of the act and I think that it reflects great credit upon the Hon. Mr. Coaker, who has brought it down. It shows his interest in the people, particularly in the fishermen, and his determination that our staple industry is to be fully protected in every possible way. I ask him to consider the points that I have raised and add them to this act when formulating his rules and regulations. I repeat that I do not subscribe to the vicious principle of delegating our duties to any outside irresponsible party, not as regards this particular act, but in the interest of legislation in general out of respect for our constitutional principles and to avoid the setting up of any dangerous precedent. I would ask the Hon. Minister to consider the unlimiting of the scope of the regulations, and I also ask him to consider as to whether or not there is any sanction for the enforcement of the act. As regards the penalizing section of the act, the Hon. Minister of Justice says that the fisherman is not to be touched, but when he attempts to sell an article, not according to the standard cure, he should be penalized. We must remember that if the act is going to be effective it must not be passed over in a haphazard manner and treated in such a fashion as not to hurt the feelings of anybody. It is absolutely useless to put such legislation on our statute book, and I am not going to be a party to it. We had the anti-smoking law and many other enactments that I could mention and which were more honored in the breach than in the observance. They were passed by previous governments, whose members were most indefatigable in the ingenuity they showed and who knew that they would never be carried out.

I support the contention of the hon. member for St. George's that we should not delegate to any outside body of men powers that are ours; but with his further statement I do not subscribe. I think he intended in his reference that the manner of the criticisms of a certain newspaper was not right and proper, that its comments were not up to the standard and that they tended to muzzle debate in this House. Now I have been a consistent reader of **The St. John's Daily Star** and I never found anything objectionable in it, but rather followed its utterances with extreme interest. I always found that it was maintaining a most excellent literary standard. I think that the refined and scholarly gentlemen who edit that paper must have cultured minds, excellent taste, rare talents, brilliant attainments, high gifts and broad ideas to keep their journalistic ethics to such a good and clever moral standard that literary men alone must prize and appreciate. These are gentlemen of the old school and, in their attempts to carry out their obligations, nothing is farther from their minds than to try and hurt the feelings of anybody. I think that their personalities bears an impression on almost every line of that estimable journal. Their sole object in view, apparently, is to bring material to a paper, and not alone to have it published here, but to show

the outside world what a high standard our press have arrived at here, what high characters our public and prominent men have and what high grounds of debate we have.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—On behalf of the Government press, to which Fr. Fox has so courteously referred, I extend to him a word of appreciation and thanks. Mr. Fox has already addressed this house at some length on a multitude of occasions during the past week and has not missed any occasion to inform the house as to his own whole-hearted sincerity and that he could be depended upon on all occasions to correctly express his views uninfluenced by political or party considerations. I feel that in this case Mr. Fox has departed from the usual traditions of an opposition member being consistently critical of anything that appeared in any newspaper not actively supporting his party, and in this case he has highly complimented the Government press, not so much perhaps because of the entire freedom of the Government press during the past six months from criticisms of opponents, but rather that because in comparison with the Opposition press during that period it has been exceptionally fair and high-toned. In view of this oft-repeated declaration by Mr. Fox of his own personal frankness and sincerity, I accept his courteous references as having the same full and complete sincerity and frankness as he has so often claimed for his own character and utterances.

HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I think the Hon. Member for St. John's East is passing comments upon the paper in question which it does not deserve. If it does not live up to the standard we should like to have it we ought not to misconstrue anything said in this House. There were one or two points raised by the Hon. Member for St. John's East (Mr. Fox). First of all he advocated the advisability of appointing the commission to deal with the standardization of fish. I think he will recognize that on these technical points in ninety-nine cases out of one hundred the Legislature passing the duty to those who know most about the subject. Supposing the House has this bill before it and draws up the rules and regulations for the standardization of cod fish, the only thing I could do was to see that they were legal, they were framed properly and the proper language was used, but I must confess it is a matter about which I know nothing and therefore cannot discuss. And if I made the rules and regulations and sent them around for the approval of the fishermen and they would say he is nonsensical who drew these up. Who was he? He was Warren the lawyer. Why should we deal with the technical side of the question where the fisheries are involved and about which most of us know nothing and bring in rules here and ask the House to discuss them. It is best to leave them to practical men and this is done not alone in Newfoundland but in every other country. Take the Board of Trade in England.

It has several sub-committees to deal with every conceivable subject of a technical nature, for instance, rules for the safety of miners, rules for quarantining, rules as to the building of ships. The rules about quarantine are dealt with by the public health board. Rules for traffic are made by the police department. Then there is the game and island fisheries board. This board regulates the catching of solmon and trout and the killing of patridge, when the close season commences and so on. If all these rules had to be made in

this House then the legislature would never get through.

It is better to leave it to those who know most about it. Now with reference to the penalties under the act the only penalty the fishermen would be liable to is only a curl one. If he put up what he said is number one quality whereas really it is number two he is a sufferer as he will not get paid for it. Now when a fisherman catches his fish he can do what he likes with it. He does not break any public health rules if he leaves it there to rot. Altho it may not be to the fishermen's interest or his neighbours to do so. In fact that is what is happening in some of the fish stores down on Water Street to-day Well for instance when he catches his fish he does not carry out the rules and cure it in the proper way the penalty will be when he comes to sell it he will not get the price for number one when his quality is only number two. I think everything is clear in the act. The matter comes under the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the honorable minister is responsble to ths House. And I have every confidence in the hon. gentleman and those that will constitute the commission .

MR. FOX:—I subscribe to the proposition that we can place confidence in the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to select the commission. I am sure that he in sincere in his intention and we will not allow anything to go wrong that he can help and I endorse that the Hon. Minister of Justice has stated. But I ask that a select committee be appointed to confer with these gentlemen who wll comprise the commission and that the commissien will work in conjunction with the select committee and make the rules and regulations before the prerogration of the House. I humbly submit that these rules and regulations be laid before us for our assent and I think the members of the House will view this reasonably but I do not presume to dictate to the members of the commission on matters of which I have not practical knowledge. I do not believe in appointing to the commission people who are outsiders and who are not responsible to the cou ntry and give them the whole control. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is only one man out of eleven people. His voice is only one of those on the commission. I ask the House to consider the principles of the bill and I thing we should know the names of those on the commission and I do not agree with placing in their hands unlimited powers when they are not responsible to the electorate. I think the matter should be completed before the closing of the House.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—Mr. Speaker after hearing the Hon. Minister of Justice and members on this side of the House I want to say a few words on the matter now before the House. From the standpoint of experience I am not qualified to speak on this question. But some time ago a fisheries board was created and we find on the board a number of clerks, but I think I am as well qualified to speak on the bill as those. I would like to know who the committee is going to be Have we any guarantee that the commission won't be the same as the fisheries board and mads up of the same kind of men. We ought to know whom the commission will be composed of before giving power to act

MR. FOX:—I understand that it is not the intention to penalize a man except in the price. If the object is merely that why bring the matter in here? Why lumber up a statue book with that kind os stuff? If the intention is merely to start some kind

of progranda why not the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries get out a little phamplet and send around to the people? If it is the intenton to to penalize merely on the price why not put in a section to the effect that when a man sells his fish the penalty will attach? I say the point I make is well taken, and I want to have it considered by the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

MR. CHEESEMAN—Mr. Speaker as I take it it is impossible to bring in all the rules and regulations that may from time to time be necessary to carry this bill into effect. It is a matter that is justly left to the commission that is to be appointed. I realize that in giving all the authority that is required to put this bill into effect is giving a big thing, but the committee will have to be changed from time to time. There is one thing I would like to see. We can tell certain men in one section of the country to pickle fish for Spain. I would like to see it arranged that a man would be fined if he pickled any fish at all. We can't pickle some fish and salt others . We can't mix it. We must do something to do away with pickled fish. If a cargo of fish is mixed it can't stand to get across I am of the opinion that we must not be too severe on the fishermen. We the exporters and the merchants, are responsible. If the merchant and the exporter handles his end of it allright the whole undertaking will be a success.

With regard for the west cost fish I would like to say a word. Along the west coast of Newfoundland fish caught in the winter season, there is no better fish in any part of the world. Portugal is a good market for bank fish, always has been.

I have only a few more words to say, Mr. Chairman. I have given this bill a great deal of consideration and I think it is a good bill, a bill whose object is wholly and solely to benefit the fishery and the fishermen of this country. I am glad that we at least have a government that is going to do something of real benefit for the the fishemen, the bone and sinew of the country as we politicians are wont to call them when we are going around looking for their support at election time. In the present minister of marine and fisheries we have the right man in the right place and I feel sure that he will carry out fairly and fearlessly any policy which he belieces to be for the general good of the country. I am prepared to give this measure my fullest support and I hope that all the other members of this assembly will do the same. Naturally the good results of this bill will not be apparent in a few weeks nor even in a few months but as time goes on I am confident that all will see the benefits of this very necessary legislation.

MR. MACDONNELL—Mr. Chairman before this bill gets thru, I would like to be assured on one or two points. I wonder when this commission have made their regulations, what would happen is these regulations, were to conflict with those already on our statute book. When they come into force will they cancel all other regulations in reference to this matter because if so we cannot take the chance of givig to an unknown body of men the power to revoke existing laws. Unfortunately we do not know what we are doing; we do not know what the proposed regulations are to be, what penalty will be provided, who are to be the men who will make these regulations or if they will take procedence over those now on the statute book. I think it is unfortunate that with regard to the bringing about of the necessary reforms we should have to abrogate our authority to

others and for this reason I must go against the bill because when you take away that section there is nothing in it. The hon. minister has said that the fishermen will not be penalized this year but that does not alter the position. It would be alright to appoint a commission of enquiry for the purpose of carrying out what changes are necessary and the best way to make them but such a commission should not have the power to make regulations.

MR. BENNETT:—I am not a fisherman nor the son of a fisherman but I have had some experience in this assembly with bills of the nature of that which is before us this evening. I fully appreciate, sir, the motive which actuates the hon. minister in introducing this measure, having for its aim the improvement of our staple industry, and as has already been stated, any bill introduced for an object of this kind is entitled to, and should receive the fullest support that we can give it. On reflection, however, I am led to the conclusion that this bill is altogether too far reaching in its effects. It is a matter which demands the gravest consideration of every hon. member of this House, when we are asked to delegate our administration powers to a commission as we will do if we pass this bill, and doingsomething that we shall some day regret. Surely sir, this assembly is as representative as any commission that could be found to consider the matter, and I think it will be appreciated that the position is a wrong one that we should shirk our responsibilities by delegating to any body of men, no matter what their qualifications or political afficlations, the power to reg ulate and control the catching, curing and marketing of the fish of the country. Looking at this bill casually and without havng due regard to its possible consequences, I would be inclined to say that from an opposition standpoint we have nothing to fear through the results accruing from the measure. I say, sir, that it means a revolution in the conduct of the fisheries of the country, but its far-reaching effects, although they may be ultimately to the benefit of the country as a whole, are certainly going to lead to a serious complication and a serious situation as regards the fishermen of the country and those engaged in the carrying on of the industries of the country. The standardization of fish is a subject which has been deliberated upon in this Assembly as much as any other subject in the past. Since the advent of the leader of the F.P.U. party and his followers in this House this matter has been more acute than heretofore and has received the serious consideration of past governments; and without going any further, I submit that the standardization of fish would be all that is necessary to do in this present instance.

Let us look at what will accrue thru the penalizing section of this bill, if the merchant purchased fish in all honesty for a certain standard and paid the price that that standard for. If he buys No. 2 fish and pays a No. 1 price for it he is penalized and if he buys No. 3 and pays a No. 2 price for it he is penalized. Naturally he is going to protect himself and is not going to put himself in the position that he will be hailed before the commission or any other constituted body to answer for a breach of the regulations that are made by that body. The result will be that when the fishermen comes in as he has in the past with the full idea that the parcel of fish he has for sale is No. 1 quality and when the merchant puts his cullers to examine that fish, he awakens to the fact that what has happened heretofore is no longer possible. During the past three or four years

most fish was sold talqual. There was a set price for that kind of fish and the merchant paid the fisherman no matter what were the relative qualities or the different grades. Under this bill, the merchant can no longer extend that latitude and the fishermen will have to subject himself to the cull, which will grade his fish down, and when he makes up the average he will find that he will receive a figure that will probably not alone disappoint him, but astound him. It was pointed out this evening by an hon .member on this side of the House a case in which a man sold his fish subject to a certain cull at $14 a quintal, but when that fish was delivered to the merchant and the cull was given in it averaged less than $7 a quintal. Well, sir, that, as I said before, is a condition that means serious trouble for those who are instrumental in bringing about this change. The justification for it I am not questioning, as I believe that some standardization of fish is absolutely desirable for our future trade and future prosperity. We are no longer in an open market unchalleneged by competition like we were within the past four or five years. It is well known to all of us that our old competitors have entered into the markets again and this will naturally bring about a reduction in the prices for our product. Instead of looking for $14 or $17 per quintal for fish, as we were a few years ago we are looking to-day for $10 or $12, which means that in order to get the price fish must be A-1 quality; but when the lower grades are culled from it we will find ourselves in the position that the average price will be, not $10 or $12, but $6 or $8. This condition of affairs may be found impossible to obviate. I am not prepared to lay any blame to the Hon. Minister or the Government for attempting to correct a situation that is bound to occur in the ordinary course of events; and, sir, I will go as far as this, that I will support the standardization of fish, but this bill goes very much farther and asks that powers be delegated to others outside of this Assembly to regulate and see how fish are caught, cured, packed and how it is to be marketed. Reference was made this afternoon to what is known as pickled fish and it was stated that pickled fish was not desirable in many of the markets. If it is the intention of the Government to disallow the pickling of fish here, I can say that they are treading on very dangerous ground, as I know of certain sections of the country that will resent this to the bitter end. No one portion of the district that I represent is one of the best fishing and most progressive settlements in the country, I refer to Petty Harbor. The entire catch of fish there is pickled ,and I have yet to learn of any trouble over the fish produced from that quarter. We may not desire it as individuals for our own purpose or for our own tables, but evidently there is a market that requires that class of fish and that market is the Spanish market.

I do not feel that I would be doing my duty if I agreed to any such delegation of powers as outlined in this bill, from this House to those who are in no way responsible to the people. We have no idea or no conception of what this commission is going to be like, who are the members or likely to be! We have no idea as to whether that commission will sit in St. John's continuously, whether they will sit here partly, or whether they will be parmanent employees of the Marine and Fisheries Department or whether they will be a permanent board of the department or anything of the kind; but we are told in this bill that the Governor in Council will appoint a board whose powers will be so far-reaching that even this legislature will take only a second place as regards the greatest

industry of the country. The principle is vicious in the extreme. If it was merely a matter of little interest or not of great moment to the country, one may say for the sake of convenience, let it go into the hands of a representative commission, but here we have the very vitals of the country concerned in this very important matter. I ask this House to hesitate before they establish a precedent that will so far take out of their hands that power, that the people of the country have placed in them, and place it in the hands of those who are not responsible and not answerable to the people of the country. I quite appreciate the desire of the hon. minister in this connection as well as in every other connection that he has shown himself for the betterment and the improvement of the fishery, and I believe that he is sincere in this and hopes to bring about a condition of things that will be for the benefit of the country in the future, but I think he has taken a very large step in this direction. He has undertaken a position that the time is not ripe for. I advise you to be more cautious and to make haste slowly and eventually you may bring about a revolution in the fishing business of this country. It was only yesterday that this bill was placed in our hands and we have not had time to consider it, yet we are asked to give our consent to what will lead to such far-reaching consequences. I do not think that this important matter should be passed over lightly but should be ventilated in the minutest detail. I am informed that fisheries in this country have been handed over to the control of certain gentlemen who are supposed to do their duty with regard to inspection and the problem of looking after what is known as our herring fishery. When that matter was before this House two or three years ago it was very strongly pointed out that we have an opportunity of establishing our herring fishery on such basis that it would stand only second to our codfishery . We got prices raised, by the innovation of the Scotch cure method, from $6 a barrel to $26 in the foreign markets, and I think that during that time we were making a name for ourselves. But unfortunately, that condition has been changed and this inspection, supposed to be carried out, has been relased and herring, instead of standing in the New York market as they did two or three years ago and commanding respectable prices, are now selling there for slaughter prices.

Where are we going to get individuals who are capable, where are we going to get a staff capable and able to supervise the affairs of the fishing business on Labrador and every other far away fishing village around the Island and see that the rules are carried out in their entirety. If they are not carried out in their entirety, if there is no machinery to put them into effect, the matter is bound to be a failure, and none of us want to see that happening.

This side of the House wants to assist the Government in bringing about an improvement in the curing and the catching of fish, but let us move cautiously, let us not make an error but go step by step and do everything thoroughly so that we might assist towards improving the fishery. This matter covers the whole situation and particularly affects the main industry of the country and we are putting in the hands of five or ten men appointed by the Governor-in-Council absolute control and giving them powers not only to make regulations but to impose fines and forfeitures and other matters.

Imake this remark not in consequenee of my own practical experience of the fishery which is small, but in consequence of knowledge which I have gleaned from those who have been connected with the fishery for the

last thirty years, in what has fallen from their lips, not only those who sit at present in this Assembly but who have in the past spoken o nthis matter, and I am led to the conviction that some steps should be considered and a thorough research made and care taken that what is being legalised and handed down on the fishermen is for their benefit.

Under this bill the fishermen are to be penalised and the merchant is to be penalised, but in the end the merchant will penalise the fishermen. If we penalise the merchant it will come back on the fishermen and will be merely a go-between to get at the fishermen in this instance.

Now sir, it is only proper that this should not be put into operation for another year, and the people should be warned; they should be given notice of what they may expect after a reasonable time so that they may be able to make preparations, and they ought to be made aware of what they will be liable to and if the people are warned and they properly understand 'the true situation and everyone is aware that the movement is entirely in his own interest and some good is being provided for the fishery it will be judicious to go ahead. But sir, we have no guarantee or assurance that if this bill passes, the remote parts of the country will know about it. Some fishermen in the remote parts of the country perhaps may find themselves in a bad position, he may find himself in an absolutely unjust position when he comes in here to St John's to sell his fish.

Move cautiously in this matter. Let us make no mistake. It is not possible to put this bill into successful operation inside two or three years. It would only mean revolution to the main industry of the country if enforced immediately. This must be done gradually and everything considered. It would be unfair to delegate the management and the entire administration of the fishery of the country to the party who will comprise this commission. In matters of this kind there is generally a select committee constituted of the members of this House to consider the matters contained in the bill. It is the province of this Assembly, constituted as it is by a large number of representatives of the fishermen to make rules and regulations and then make them the law of the land. If we do not do it this session, well, the next, until the large body of men who represent both the people and the fishermen of this country who have the practical experience which they have demonstrated until the ten F.P.U. men in this House, who must of necessity, know the every phase of the fishery ,have made the rules and regulations.

Still on this side of the House there are also men of wide experience as to the curing and the catching of fish and to a committee of those men ought to fall the duty of perusing the rules and regulations. This is too important a matter to be glossed over lightly, of too serious a consequence, and that is why I am opposed to the contemplated movement. Naturally it is not going to be popular with the fishermen. The fishermen will suffer before any good will come of it, and it ought not contain anything that will make them suffer. For these various reasons I wish to go on record as being opposed to the passing of a measure of this kind.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—In reply to the remarks of the hon. member for St. John's West I think he has not given the matter before the chair very much thought. It is evident from the remarks of the hon. member that he is not aware of the fact that as long ago as October 1909 this matter has been a live matter to the fishermen of the country, and at the convention held at Change Islands

in 1909 resolutions were passed asking the Government to introduce legislation upon the very same lines as are included in the bill before the House. A deputation was appointed to interview the Prime Minister, who then was Sir Edward Morris. He received the deputation and spent four hours conversing with it, and the points in this bill from beginning to end are the same as were contained in the resolutions passed at the convention. But the legislation was not passed. In all probability it was no fault of the Prime Minister but the fault of competitors. The Government party of that day was not the fishermen's party and may for want of knowledge did not take up the matter. Ever since that time the Fishermen's Union has been agitating the passing of legislation of this nature. Every convention since 1909 this point has been discussed and never has there been a dissenting voice during all those conventions. The fishermen of the north have fought for it for ten years past. So for the fishermen's side of the matter it is the fishermen's desire. The fishermen only hope that a bill of the sort before the chair will become law. Now the exporters of the country are unanimously in favor of the bill. In January last there was a meeting of the exporters and for four months now the exporters have considered and revised the bill in every detail, the same bill as is now before the House. So if the fishermen of the north are unanimously in favor of it and the exporters are unanimously in favor of it the objection of the hon. member for St. John's West is not worth while. Every point of the bill has been considered and thrashed out.

The commission is given the power incase it wants to use it, if time shows that it needs the powers. The commission will be representative and the first man whom I asked to serve on the commission was Sir John Crosbie. He said he was afraid he would not be able to act on the commission, but when the commission is appointed, members of the opposition will be asked to become members. The hon. leader of the opposition will be asked. It is up to us to have such an act as this enacted. You need have no fears regarding the enforcement of the clause concerning pickled fish. I have no desire to allow anything to be done that is not for the best interests of the country. The only concern that I have is whether or not it is for the best intertsts of the country. The matter of the pickling of fish is one that must be regulated. We have a sale for 300,000 quintals, but we don't want any more pickled fish than we have a market for. The mixing of pickled and salt fish in a cargo is a curse to the trade. There is not a year that $1,000,000 is not lost through the mixing of fish.

The member for St. George's and the member for St. John's East say that we are giving too much power to the commission. The matter of culling and standardizing may have to be changed from year to year. We cannot come back to this House and spend two or three days talking about amendments. The Board of Trade was given full power to deal with this matter by their constitution when it was first drawn up. I strongly opposed giving this power to the Board of Trade. I told them I would alarm the people and create an agitation against it because I held the Board of Trade, representing only exporters, should not remake the cull of fish. The idea was then abandoned.

Conditions in other countries are different. The whole of the curing is done by large establishments. If we had a few large establishments handling all our fish we would do the same thing. But we have to do the very best possible. As it is at the present time, there is no law regarding the

culling of fish, the curing of fish, or the shipping of fish, and as a result, we are up against all kinds of difficulties in marketing our product. The merchant can ship as prime No. 1 any quality that we may have on hand. The result is that he spoils the market to which that fish is sent, for all fish that may come after, no matter how good, lies under suspicion. The very fact that the hon. leader of the opposition and Sir John Crosbie are in accord with it is evidence that the bill is the best that we at the present time can introduce.

We are trying to bring about a system that we all shall be proud of. A lot of time has been spent in putting this bill into shape, and I think it is the very best that we know of just now. If twelve months from now we see that the bill is not applicable, then we will have it amended. We will not have anything done that will be against the interests of the fishermen. There is not now, nor will there ever be a government who is not afraid of the power of the fishermen. I don't think we should spend any more time debating this question. We are all anxious to do the very best.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make just one remark with regard to what the hon. minister has just said. I think he misunderstands our position. We oppose delegating the powers of this Assembly to any commission. We have the same thing in the words of the hon. minister himself. He objected to delegating the powers of this House to the Board of Trade. This is exactly the same principle. I endorse the stand that he took with respect to the Board of Trade, but I am surprised that he has changed his position. I thoroughly endorse the intentions of this act. It is a most necessary thing. But I object to delegating the powers that the people of the country have given to the members of this Assembly only. I say that if the minister will withdraw this objectionable clause I will give the bill my unqualified support.

HON. MINISTER POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS: — Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a few words in reference to some remarks made by one of the hon. members of the opposition. The hon. member of St. John's West said that this measure would cause a revolution in the fishery of this country, and he also said that we should go slowly, that the time was not ripe for such a measure. I am informed by Mr. Coaker that a delegation of the F.P.U. called on Sir Edward Morris when he held the reins of power with the object of having this law placed upon the statute book but he could not get his party to agree to it. Remarks from the lips of one of his associates a few moments ago make us wonder if it were possible to do such a thing. This idea of moving slowly has been going on for centuries. The question of the cure of cod has been necessary for the past thirty years, and yet the hon. member for St. John's West comes in here to-night and tells us that the time is not ripe for such a measure. He also informs us that a revolution will be caused in the fishery conditions. I am surprised to hear such remarks from the lips of an ex-colonial secretary. Here are examples of the tie-up of legislation by the previous government. On June 5th, 1919, this legislature was asked to consider a bill for the entering into a contract for coastal service. Further on an act to authorise the Governor-in-Council for improvement of mail service.

MR. BENNNETT:— Did you oppose it?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS:—Oppose it? Yes. They were also asked to enter into an agreement for improved telephone service. All these bills were railroaded

through this House last year. Another important act in connection with the St. George's Coal Fields was railroaded through the House in the space of 24 hours. Mr. Fox, with full knowledge of these facts, has associated himself with such men who are guilty of these things. He pleads ignorance of these facts. These things should have been done by Sir Edward Morris, and they would have been done but for the dead-wood' which brought him down into the hole. This commission will only have powers to advise the Governor-in-Council and it will be left for them to decide whether they will have the rules and regulations that they suggest placed on the statute book. Why, if it were not possible to appoint this commission we might as well dispose of all road boards and committees and meet here day in and day out to transact the business of the country. I have nothing more to say. Let those men who have a practical knowledge of the fishing industry air their remarks. Now we have the opinion of these men who are well versed in the language of fish, opinions that we have very much respect for and I am sure they know what they are talking about and this bill is good enough for us.

MR. FOX:—I regret very much that I didn't seek his assent before I had thrown in my lot with this party. I trust he will pardon me for my oversight, but he has been buttressing my argument. I would like to point out to Mr. Halfyard that the delegation of powers to the Executive Council is a totally different matter than the delegation of power to a commission of irresponsibles.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS:—In section 4 it states that "All such rules and regulations shall be laid before His Excellency the Governor in Council for approval." Is't that delegating the powers to the Governor-in-Council and not to the commission?

MR. FOX:—It is delegating powers to the commission, to Water St. merchants. The commission may be responsible to parliament but it is a totally different position when you go into the street and give them legislature for anything they want, and in any case does the hon. minister say that two wrongs will make a right. On his own admission he objected to that principle two years ago and I take it that that objection came from a common sense man, and I say now that if it was wrong then he cannot set it up now. If we are to conduct legislation in that fashion what is to prevent us from going back over the life of past governments and committing the same offences that they have been guilty of.

MR. GOSSE:—I realized when I came in here to-night that we are up against some very mysterious thing. I wouldn't talk about taking the bone out of codfish. Some of these gentlemen here wouldn't know which end of a codfish the tail was on. You are talking about the standardization of codfish and what condition it should be in for a decent man in Portugal or Spain to eat. In my opinion now we have no necessity to argue over an act which should have been passed years ago. Mr. Coaker brings in a bill and gentlemen from the other side criticize it when it is only a matter of making a good codfish. The only way to cure this is not to buy a bad one. Refuse to buy bad fish and you will always get good fish. Now, when I see valuable time being wasted by gentlemen who I presume are just hanging up time, it makes me feel bad. I think we should do better. Why, it is only a matter of making a good fish and the people are objecting to our waste of time.

MR. BENNETT:—The Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs made reference to me a few minutes ago in a

manner which I hardly appreciate. I merely endeavoured to express my views and he took occasion to refer to some things that have happened during the time of Sir Edward Morris. He referred to the deadwood which was holding the Prime Minister back. I might inform him that this matter was never brought before the Executive Council during that time, therefore the "deadwood" did not hold back. The matter was brought up here and was referred to a select committee of this House.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES:—You weren't in the Executive in 1909.

MR. BENNETT:—No, oh that was away back. I could not have been in the deadwood, you will have to explain that to some other party. But, as far as holding back any legislation is concerned I am glad to know I had power over such a man to hold him back.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the introducer of this bill if it is the intention of the Government to give the herring fishery any attention? Are you going to bring in another bill or make provision for it in this one? Remember the herring fishery was worth a million dollars here a few years ago and now it is going out of existence very quickly.

HON MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES:—Mr. Chairman, I do not think it would be wise to mix up a herring bill with a codfish bill . If we are going to deal with it, deal with it as a separate bill. The latest suggestion is that the herring board will go out of business and the powers of the Marine and Fisheries act vested in the herring board will be transferred to the fishery board. We are doing that because we think the fishery board will more generally represent the country, and if there are any defects in connection with the herring business, we might be able to remedy them in connection with the powers of the fishery board. I agree with the hon. leader of the opposition with regard to the importance of the herring fishery. A couple of years ago it was worth one million dollars, though last year it was worth half as much. I hold with him that the matter is of great importance and that something should be done to place the herring business on a sound basis. If he wishes to help me in preparing a bill to encourage the herring fishery, I shall be delighted. We have had some experience ourselves, and perhaps we might get some men engaged in the herring fishery to aid us to devise a bill that will improve existing conditions.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of attention to the debate which has taken place on this bill to provide for the standardization of codfish, and find the situation, so far as the opposition is concerned, to be as follows: Sir John Crosbie gave his hearty and unqualified endorsation to this bill. He thought it was a measure that should have been undertaken years ago and made it clear that in his opinion if the commission were a representative and sane one the effect of the bill and the regulations which might be made thereunder would be of very great benefit to the fisheries of the colony. Sir Michael Cashin supported the bill with equal strength and in somewhat similar terms. He raised the objection, however, that the penalties which would be imposed for violation of the regulations should be specified in the bill. That criticism was fully met when it was explained that a bill which created one or two particular offences should specify the penalties for these specific offences, but a biil which created a commission to draft rules and regulations affecting such a large matter as the standardization of codfish could not possibly specify the penalties which would be im-

posed for the breach of regulations the nature of which cannot be known before the bill is passed and the commission has undertaken its work. That explanation has been fully concurred in by the hon. the senior member for St. John's East, Mr. Higgins, and I understand the leader of the opposition is fully satisfied that in that particular the bill is as complete as it is possible to make it at the present moment.

The hon. Mr. Bennett has expressed himself, I regret to say, as most aggressively opposed to this bill. He states that the bill means a revolution in the codfish industry of the country. He objects to the appointment of a commission to deal with these matters, and thinks that all the rules and regulations which are to be made should be now submitted to this legislature, that they should now become law and be unalterable until the next session of the legislature, when they could be revised. It is scarcely necessary for me to point out the absurdity of such a position. There was one statement which the hon. member made which gave great pleasure to the Government. It was as follows: "This bill will eventually lead to the advantage of the fisheries, but if a man were looking at his own political advantage and his own political future he would be foolish to support a measure of this sort. It is a bold move and the men who would pass it must be bold men and must feel themselves well entrenched." In that statement Mr. Bennett drew a clear distinction between his own line of conduct and the line of conduct of the members of the present Government. Mr. Bennett declares his own oppressive opposition to this measure because he evidently, according to his own statement,, thinks more of an immediate political advantage or his own personal political future than he thinks of the welfare of the fisheries of the country. This Government may, as Mr. Bennett says, be bold men to undertake a measure of this sort, but they have undertaken it, and the fact that Sir Michael Cashin, the leader of the opposition, and Sir John Crosbie, which two gentlemen are the two practical experts on the opposition benches, concur in the necessity of the measure and have volunteered to support it, shows conclusively that those on the opposition benches who know what they are talking about feel that this policy is one which should be undertaken.

As to whether this bill is to the present or future political advantage of the Government which has undertaken the responsibility for the passage of the measure through this House is not a matter in which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or myself or any other member of the Government is primarily concerned. The important question is not what popularity or unpopularity the Government or any member of the Government gets from the passage of this measure; the vital questions are, How will this bill affect the fishermen of the country? How will it affect the trade of the country? What will be its effect upon the fishery industry of the country I am satisfied sir, that what Mr. Bennett says is correct, namely, that ultimately it will have a revolutionary effect upon the cure and marketing of our staple product. I am satisfied, as Mr. Bennett has said, that it will eventually lead to the advantage of the country, and regret that a man who has held important public office as Mr. Bennett has should stand in his place as one of the representatives for the important constitutency of St. John's West and declare that in spite of that he was going to oppose the bill because he felt that no man who had any regard for his own present or future political advantage would support it.

On behalf of the Government, sir,

and particularly on behalf of myself and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is the minister in charge of this bill through this House, I assert that the question is not what present advantage or disadvantage may accrue to the Government or any member of the Government because of the stand they are taking in the matter; the only motive which is controlling the Government is the ultimate advantage which the leading members of the opposition admit will accrue to this colony by its passage, and even if it were true, as Mr. Bennett states, that our support of this bill will be to our political disadvantage in the interest of the colony, which interest it is our privilege to advance by our support of this measure. Otherwise we would be mere hirelings and time-servers, looking to our own political advantage rather than to the advantage of those whose best interests we are here to serve.

The most absurd criticism, however, that has been offered is that advanced by my hon. friends, Mr. MacDonnell, the member for St. George's, and Mr. Fox, the junior member for St. John's East, and the absurd line of reasoning which they advanced has been followed by some other members of the opposition. Messrs. MacDonnell and Fox take the position that it is highly improper for this House of Assembly to place in the hands of a commission, no matter how representative and capable, the power of making rules and regulations relating to the cure of codfish. Mr. Fox has pointed out that some years ago the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries objected to a section being put in the act for the incorporation of the Board of Trade under which the Board of Trade would be authorised to do this very thing. These gentlemen argued that the House was acting in an unconstitutional manner and was delegating its powers to a body of men not responsible to this legislature and not responsible to the country. These gentlemen declared the most aggressive hostility to this measure based upon these arguments. My hon. friends evidently omitted to take the trouble to read the bill. The commission referred to in paragraph 1, and of the bill is authorised "to prepare and draft rules and regulations for the improvement of the manner in which salt codfish is prepared for sale and transported." If that commission were authorised by the bill not merely to prepare and draft rules and regulations but to first prepare and draft rules and regulations and then on their own responsibility to enforce them, the criticisms of my hon. friends would be perfectly in order and the case would be parallel to that objected to by the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. Coaker, when he took the position ten years ago that such powers should not be placed in the hands of the Board of Trade. I would point out, however, that the very next section, namely, Section Four, the section which my hon. friends omitted to read, provides as follows:

"All such rules and regulations shall be laid before His Excellency the Governor in Council for approval, and if and when so approved and published in The Royal Gazette shall have the force and effect of law as if incorporated in this act."

Thus their entire argument is absurd. The commission merely prepares and drafts rules and regulations. These rules and regulations must then be laid before His Excellency the Governor in Council. The rules and regulations do not come into effect until they have been so approved. The body responsible to this House and responsible to the people of the country for all rules and regulations is consequently not the commission, which has merely power to prepare and draft rules and regulations and to submit

them to the Council; the body responsible to this legislature and to the country is the Executive Government. Thus Section Four of the bill answers emphatically the arguments advanced b ythe hon. members opposite against this measure.

Mr. Fox argues that because Mr. Coaker opposed this power being given to the Board of Trade some years ago, he is now contradicting himself in vesting the power in this commission. Mr. Coaker has pointed out that he opposed the power being vested in the Board of Trade for two reasons: First, because the Board of Trade would not be a representative body for the purpose of making rules and regulations in connection with the cure of codfish. It would be representative of the wealthy classes; it would be representative of the fish buyers and the fish shippers, but it would not be representative of the middle-man, the schooner owner and the fisherman. To put this matter entirely in the hands of the Board of Trade, as was the proposition to which Mr. Coaker objected some years ago, would be putting it in the hands of a class which could not be regarded as in any way representative of and in any certain instances sympathetic with the interest of the fisherman. This commission is to be a truly representative commission. There will be on it members of the Board of Trade. It will be non-political, because on it there will be members of the opposition as well as members of the government. There will be no class distinction because on the commission will be practical fishermen, and the various sections of the country will be properly represented. Thus, sir, it is patent to even the most careless thinker that the parallel suggested by my honourable friend does not exist. Then again, the Board of Trade would be open to all the criticisms and objections which my hon. friends, Messrs. MacDonnell and Fox, hurled against this bill because they had omitted to read Section Four to which I have already referred. Mr. Coaker objected to the Board of Trade being given this authority not merely because it would mean that the buying and shipping classes would be regulating this important matter for all classes, but because that body would not be responsible to this House and would not be responsible to the people of the country. All the objections which Mr. Fox urged against this measure are the objections which Mr. Coaker urged against these powers being vested in the Board of Trade. These are arguments which I would myself urge against this bill if these rules and regulations were to be made and enforced by this commission entirely on its own responsibility and without governmental control. But, sir, such is not the case. Under Section Four of the act it is the executive government, responsible to this house and responsible to the people, which passes rules and regulations prepared by this commission and submitted for approval or otherwise, and these rules and regulations do not become law until so approved. Thus again the parallel suggested by Mr. MacDonnell and Mr. Fox is seen not to exist.

I must again quote Mr. Bennett when he stated that the reason why he opposed this bill was because of its revolutionary character, and say that I support this bill, and call upon the entire opposition to follow the leadership of the practical fishery experts of the opposition. Sir Michael Cashin and Sir John Crosbie, who have already voiced their support of the measure, and give this bill a unanimous passage in this chamber. I support it because I believe it will, as the years go by, revolutionize the curing of codfish in this country. Newfoundland imports beef and pork and flour, and it knows the

quality of the article by the brand that is on the barrel. Why should not Newfoundland codfish go forth to the foreign market in such a way that the foreign purchaser will know the class and quality of the fish that is in the package by the brand that is on it? The time has come, sir, when we must depart forever from the loose, unbusiness like, unscientific and haphazard methods used in connection with the curing of our codfish and get an article which will have a recognized standard in the foreign market, so that the name "Newfoundland" on the head of a fish-drum will be as well known in the fish markets of the world as is the name of Cape Race known throughout the world of wireless telegraphy.

It has been suggested that this is a bill which may penalise the fishermen and possibly subject them to fines and forfeitures in connection with the ordinary conduct by them year by year of their fishery operations. I feel that that position has already been made abundantly clear to the House. I would merely point out in this connection that the fishermen are not to be subject to fines and forfeitures as to compel them to improve the cure of codfish. The fishermen are to be educated into better methods of cure; they are to be informed by circulars and pamphlets from the Department of Marine and Fisheries as to how best to handle their fish. They will be encouraged in every effort to treat fish as an article of human food and to cure it in such a way that it will fetch the best price in the foreign market. The only fines and forfeitures, sir, will be the disadvantage which will accrue to the careless or indifferent man who will not interest himself in improving his cure and will consequently not get as good as if he had taken more care in preparing it. The ide aof the harsh enforcement of penalties against fishermen for the violation of rules and regulations laid down under the authority of this act is not within the contemplation of the government, but rather will rules and regulations be made for the guidance of the fishermen in the improvement of the cure, and to enable them to get the very best price that they possibly can for the article which their toil produces, the article which forms the staple export product of this colony.

I again, sir, call upon this House in the name of the fishermen of Newfoundland and our staple industry, to give this bill unanimous support and let us see to it that the name "Newfoundland" identified with codfish will be a brand of honor and security to the purchaser who when he sees the name on the package will know that the package contains just what it represents itself to contain, and not of uncertain grade and quality as has so often happened in the past.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Chairman, cut out those last few words about the fixing of penalties in sub-section 7. I do not think that those words ought be tacked on to that section, but should merely come in as a new paragraph altogether.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Chairman, just a word arising out of the remarks of the hon. leader of the government. I think it has been disclosed from the debate generally that the only point upon which there is any attitude of apparent opposition taken is the principle with reference to the powers given to the advisory board.

Might I suggest, if it is necessary to suggest it, and it is the position we take on this side of the house in the matter, that the Governor-in-Council will see when this commission has reported that ample opportunity in the way of notice shall be given where minor matters might be treated as something to be penalized for and for which the people should be prepared. I think that point will occur to the Hon.

Minister of Marine and Fisheries when he looks at sub-section 2 of section 3 and later at sub-section 4. The point I make is this, that I recognize myself that in a matter of this kind the regulations cannot be haphazard but as thorough and as proper as it is possible to make them. I realise that it is a big question and it is going to take the commission, no matter how well chosen or how competent they may be, a considerable time to deal with it, as the scope of advising is large and as that advising may take in regulations that might appear trivial at first and yet make considerable inconvenience if introduced in a careless, haphazard fashion.

Regarding the district of St. John's East, I would only ask the Governor-in-Council that if they are going to have any radical change of method for the treatment of fish that we get more than one single notice and that before they give effect of law to any change they may desire that the fullest and most extended notice possible be given throughout the country.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for St. John's East has clearly stated the views of the Government in this regard. The bill is intended to help, not to impede; to encourage, not to penalize. No drastic measures will be undertaken. Information will be circulated amongst the fishermen, and everything possible that can be done to help and encourage them towards the improvement of the cure of fish will be undertaken. Ample notice will be given as to any rules and regulations recommended by the commission and approved of by the Governor-in-Council. Improvements in the cure of fish can be brought about only by interesting the fishermen and letting them see for themselves that it is to the advantage of the fishing industry of the colony, which means to their own individual advantage, to improve the cure, and not by attempting hasty or unreasonable pressure.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Chairman, there is just one point that I am not clear on. As stated this afternoon, I welcome the bill and, perhaps, may vote for it. With regard to the personnel of the commission. I am glad that the hon. minister has tendered an invitation to this side of the House to act on it. I would like to see at least two practical fishermen on that commission. I mean men who are actually engaged catching fish. A man may have been a practical fisherman in his past life and to-day be a buyer and an exporter, and with all respect for that particular class of man, it would give an idea that he was looking after his own interest, and it may be thought among the fishermen that their interests were not safeguarded.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES:—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the hon. member, I might say that I do not know whether it would be wise to state the names of two practical fishermen, but I can certainly promise him that shall be. The fish exporters had a meeting a few days ago and asked me to include five exporters on the commission and to be elected by the Board of Trade. I objected to such a proposal because first it was dictating to us, and next that five would be all the membership of the commission. Immediately the impression got about that we were allowing the Board of Trade to dominate us. I got busy. With regard to the question of the hon. member for Placentia, I would inform him that there will be two practical fishermen on the commission and probably three. In reference to the suggestion of the Hon. Mr. Higgins as to notice to be given. I am prepared to alter that clause, making it imperative that 30 days notice be given, so that on every occasion when the rules and

regulations are brought into force, at least 30 days notice will be given.

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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider the bill entitled "An Act to provide for the better obtaining of information respecting the Cod Fishery."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of committee.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES:—Regarding this bill some of my friends on the opposite side object to it because information is given to the foreign markets as regarding the catch of fish. I do not know whether there is much in that objection, but if they feel that the information should not go out of the country I have no objection to inserting that in the bill. But I would like to point out ,no matter what the bill contains, the information will go abroad. Every country has its representative here in St. John's. Brazil knows what is going on here. Italy knows what amount of fish is caught here, and the Portuguese Government has all the information it requires, and even if we put a clause in this bill, prohibiting the information going abroad, it will have no effect in so preventing the foreign markets. We know week by week what catch there is in Norway, but nevertheless this knowledge by us does not affect the markets where the Norwegian fish goes. Every up-to-date business man abroad knows what is going on in Newfoundland, and if he does not know why he is carrying on business in the twentieth century. I have no desire that we injure the fishermen's interests in Newfoundland by giving out information, and if it will improve their interests, I have no objection to inserting something to that effect in the bill.

Now, the principle of the bill is that all schooners arriving in Newfoundland shall have to report within forty-eight hours after their arrival and state the quantity of fish on board and whether it is to be made as Labrador shore or Labrador soft, or shore and the possession of these facts will help us to know the quantity of fish we shall have to offer to the foreign markets and of the quantity of stocks we have for each. The point in connection with this bill that the exporters will be able to get fair ideas of the stocks held and the different qualities contained in the various stocks. This is necessary information for the advisory board. That board should know what fish there is to be shipped and for what markets it is suitable. This may not be perfect as it will not cover the shore fishery, but we can get the information from the sub-collectors which will be fairly reliable, although in some sections it is not as accurate as it might be. The Labrador catch has always been uncertain.

In 1917, we had a meeting of the exporters and one member stated that there was over half a million quintals of Labrador fish and they could only offer about three dollars and sixty cents per quintal. The fact of the matter was that there was only three hundred thousand quintals of fish that year. Now this statement had the effect of sending a fog along Water St. and created a despondency, but we informed the exporters that the Italian Government wanted a lot of fish. The information put life in the buyers, and consequently the price started at five

dollars and fifty cents per quintal and not three dollars and sixty cents. Last year all believed that the Labrador catch was a very large one. It turned out that there was not enough Labrador fish to go round and it has been disposed of at a fair price. If the trade knew stocks of Labrador were so short last fall, they would have held for higher prices, but they were anxious to sell and wanted to dispose of it at any price before the crash came. The price fell from one hundred and five shillings down to seventy-nine because of inaccurate information. If, in the future, we find that we can obtain from the statistics of the fish inspectors certain information as regards the shore catch, we shall have power, under this act, to secure suc hinformation.

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 to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider the bill entitled "An Act to Incorporate the Women's Patriotic Association of Newfoundland."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The chairman from the committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the bill without amendment.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider the bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 11 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) 'Of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.'"

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The chairman from the committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the bill without amendment.

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

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Vinnicombe gave notice of question.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled "An Act to confirm a Contract between the Government and the 'Susu Steamship Company, Ltd.'"

Hon. Mr. Foote gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 183 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Management and Control of the Harbor of Grand Bank.'"

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled "An Act to confirm a Contract between the Government and the St. Lawrence Steamship Pulp & Lumber Company, Ltd."

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Speaker, in moving the adjournment of the House, I wish to avail of this opportunity to call your attention and the attention of the hon. members to what I consider to be the most brutal, cowardly and absolutely uncalled for attack which has

ever been made against any public man in my memory. I had listened with a great deal of attention and pleasure a few nights ago when Sir John Crosbie made an honest and gentlemanly appeal for a cleaner public press, and I had hoped that the Hon. the Prime Minister, who is the controlling factor in the management of one of our daily papers, The Star, would try and bring sufficient reform to bear on his personal organ so that decent citizens might be able to permit its entry into their homes without risking the future purity of their innocent little children. But, sir, I am sorry to say that the whole stock-in-trade of The St. John's Daily Star appears to me to be gutter snipe journalism, and The Daily Star seems to have a goodly stock of gutter snipes amongst its scribblers. The misleading, contemptible reference to me, which appears to-day's issue of The Star, can have only one object, and that object to do me a personal injury, not a political injury either, and sir, if we were now engaged in a political contest I may be able to forgive the writer on the grounds that his political enthusiasm was allowed for the moment to stultify his manhood, but sir, I am convinced that manhood is no characteristic part of the writer, and I am glad that his real identity is unknown to me, for if I knew him the results would be painful if not disastrous, for him. Not only is insult offered to me, but the contemptible cur, the disreputable vampire hurls his insult from behind the screen of his infamous filthy sheet, in the faces of the thousands of honest, respectable, independent electors of the historic district of Placentia and St. Mary's, who sent me to this Assembly as one of their representatives, and sent me here with no crawl-in-vote, either, but as an appreciation of my six years' services, gave me over five hundred increased majority over my 1913 vote, a district which has sent its sons to fill honored positions both in church and state.

Mr. Speaker, I have no newspaper to defend me, but I have my seat in this chamber, and I am going to avail of my constitutional right to defend myself from this scandal-monger, and yellow journalistic crook. Only a foul, base and diseased mind could deliberately put in cold type such a mendacious utterance. Irepeat, sir, that this literary assassin is a cold-blooded reptile, is unfit for human society, and his proper place is slouching aimlessly in the polluted waters of a dead sea, with serpents of his class and breeding for company.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until Monday next, 10th inst., at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, May 10, 1920

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

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled the report of the Minister of Agriculture, 1919.

MR. ABBOTT:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave ta present a petition from the inhabitants of Cannaille South, Bonavista, for the sum of $150,00 for the purpose of digging and concreting a public well in that part of the town. The supply of water at this place is somewhat impure, so much so that annual visit of typhoid fever has been the result. Pure water is essential to pure health so I hope this matter will be given the attention it deserves by the department to which it relates.

MR. WINSOR:—Mr. Speaker, I have pleasure in supporting this petition.

MR. MacDONNELL.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Curling and Summerside for a grant for a cross ferry.

At the present moment the only ferry in that bay is one that makes several round trips every day. This petition is for a cross ferry to connect with the train. It would take about $1200,-00 to operate a gasoline boat.

MR. WINSOR:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Safe Harbor. It is signed by the inhabitants of that place and of the adjourning places, and askes for the sum of money for the improvement of the road to the church and school; also for a sum of money for the repair of the road from Loo Cove to Safe Harbor. Also a petition that Safe Harbor be made a port of call for the bay boat. Also a petition that a light be placed on Pool's Harbor Shagg Rock.

MR. HIBBS:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Fogo asking for the sum of $3,000-00 to erect a public wharf. The landing wharf at Fogo was destroyed some years ago, and since then the people of that important place have been at a great disadvantage in this respect. The petitioners asks that a wharf be erected near the Court House which is centrally located. The object of the people of Fogo is to have a Post Office erected on this site later on, and having the wharf in close proximity, the handling of mail matter can be greatly facilitated. Every Hon. Member in this House I am sure will admit that Fogo is one of our most important Northern Outport towns, and that an effort should be made to give them this much needed public facility. I ask that this petition be received and referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries when I feel sure it will receive due consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the residents of Joe Batt's Arm asking for a small sum of $50.00 for the purpose of digging a public well. Perhaps no part of Newfoundland has suffered so much because of the lack of a sufficient supply of pure water as this section of Fogo district. From Fogo to Tilting the formation of the land is such as to render it very difficult to obtain pure water, and I propose to ask the Government this year for a sum of money to purchase a Keystone Well Drill, by which I hope to solve the water problem in the district. I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of this petition.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition from the Members of the Society of United Fshermen of Seldom Come By, asking for the sum of $100. for the purpose of building a road leading to the Hall. This road is also one that is used by the general public. Last year, I happened to go to this place and found only a rugged footpath there, in fact the place was positively dangerous to travel by night, and I realize the necessity of attending to this matter at the very earliest moment. I have much pleasure in presenting this petition, and would ask the Department of Public Works to have a sum allocated for this purpose.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:— Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a word or two with reference to the answer to a question of mine, tabled by the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs. As you are aware Sir, reference has been made in the recent debating in this House to a charge publicly made against my daughter, and in which the insinuation was thrown out that there had been wrongdoing in the Department of Finance of which I was the head at the time this charge that I now refer to, was made. One of the principal features of an address delivered by the Leader of the Government to his constituents in St. John's West at a meeting held by him and his colleague dur-

ing the campaign previous to the bye-election at the Majestic Theatre, was that Cashin's daughter had received over two thousand dollars in commissions for selling bonds in connection with the loan of 1918. Altho there were some sixty other names on the list from which the name of my daughter was picked out, the leader of the government was unfair and ungentlemanly enough to pass over the others so as to make it appear that only the one amount had been paid. Naturally, I took exception to this and asked that the full list of the names be tabled. Now sir, what really happened was this. The government of the day, two members of which were Messrs. Coaker and Halfyard, decided to allow a discount of two per cent to any person buying bonds to the value of fifty thousand dollars or over and to pay a commission of two per cent to any person selling bonds to the value of the same amount. My daughter took something over one hundred thousand dollars worth of bonds and received this discount and I want it to go down in the Hansard so that the matter may be set right before the public that if my daughter did wrong in getting this discount so did the sixty odd others whose names are on the list I have here and which I shall now read to the House.

LOAN.

Commission on sale of bonds 1918.

F. L. Bradshaw	$ 3,710.70
Bank of Montreal	3,567.00
M. Martin	37.00
B. M. Young, St. Jacques	5.00
Bank of Nova Scotia	2,625.00
Royal Bank of Canada	1,803.75
Nfld. Savings Bank	852.50
Can. Bank of Commerce	398.25
Bank of N. Scotia, Burgeo	47.50
Bank of N. Scotia, Twillingate	66.00
Bank of N. Scotia, Grand Bank	35.25
Bank of N. Scotia, Fogo	61.75
Bank of N. Scotia, Burin	21.25
Bank of N. Scotia, L.B. Is.	4.25
Bank of N. Scotia, Harbor Grace	358.00
Bank of N. Scotia, Bonavista	83.50
Royal Bank of Canada, Trinity	11.75
Bank of N. Scotia, Carbonear	154.00
Bank of N. Scotia, Wesleyville	12.75
Bank of Montreal, Curling	79.00
Bank of Montreal, Grand Falls	159.00
Royal Bank of Canada, Heart's Content	99.00
Bank of Nova Scotia, Bell Island	63.75
Royal Bank of Canada, Placentia	46.75
Bank of Nova Scotia, Old Perlican	3.00
Bank of Nova Scotia, Brigus	60.75
Bank of Nova Scotia, Catalina	112.25
Royal Bank of Canada, West End	134.75
Bank of Nova Scotia, Bay Roberts	25.25
Miss M. Young	8.00
T. J. Morrow	7.00
E. Soper	9.50
W. Cunningham	31.25
S. Wiseman, Fortune Hr	10.00
W. E. Parsons, Hr. Breton	10.00
	$14,729.45

WAR LOAN 1918

Discount on Bonds at 98.20

Rothwell & Bowring	$ 963.90
Royal Stores, Ltd	1,100.00
W. J. Edgar	2,316.60
J. Baird, Ltd	1,350.00
McCurdy & Co	1,757.00
C. H. Emerson	900.44
Reid Newfoundland Co	900.44
Marine Disasters Fund	1,800.00
Bank of Nova Scotia	900.00
Ayre & Sons, Ltd	1,350.00

Job Brothers & Co.	1,350.00
J. Sellars.	1,530.00
Miss Cashin.	2,425.50
Colonial Cordage Co.	1,980.00
Hon. D. A. Ryan.	1,800.00
E. Collishaw.	900.00
A. S. Rendell & Co.	1,344.60
Parker and Roil.	2,241.90
F. J. Roil & Co.	1,924.20
Sir E. R. Bowring.	1,980.00
H. P. Emerson.	1,341.90
Hon. M. G. Winter.	1,341.90
Eastern Trust Co.	1,350.00
S. O. Steel.	180.00
T. H. Griffiths.	144.00
W. B. Grieve.	540.00
Can. Bank of Commerce. . .	900.00
Sir J. C. Crosbie.	900.00
J. J. McGrath.	1,385.90
	$40,157.80

You will see sir that there are on this list more than sixty names and the amount involved is between fifty and sixty thousand dollars but in spite of this fact my daughter's name was the only one picked out to be held up to ridicule and in order to give out the impression that I, in my official capacity, did wrong in paying this money.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:— I realize that the honourable the Leader of the Opposition was out of order in the observations which he has just made and that I too am out of order in replying, but I feel that the House will extend to me that courtesy. Sir Michael Cashin has again stated that which I have already denied. He has repeated his statement that at a political meeting held in the Majestic Theatre in January last the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Hon. Mr. Brownrigg, and myself, singled out the name of his daughter, Miss Mary Cashin, for the purpose of attack, because she had received $2,500 from the finance office, when Sir Michael was Minister of Finance, as commission on the sale of Newfoundland Government bonds. I merely repeat that Sir Michael Cashin's statement is false. I am not aware that Mr. Brownrigg referred to Miss Cashin's name on that or any other occasion. He may have done so, but I do not remember hearing him do so, and if he did make anything more than a casual reference to her name at that meeting I should probably remember it. As I have already informed Sir Michael Cashin in this House, what happened was this. Sir Michael Cashin published a letter in The Evening Telegram criticising the Minister of Finance, Mr. Brownrigg, and asking him to get from his Department a statement of the disbursements in connection with the floatation of the loan. Sir Michael's intention in writing the letter was to discredit his opponent, Mr. Brownrigg, and suggest that he did not know how the costs were made up. A statement was secured from Mr. Keating in accordance with Sir Michael's suggestion in the letter. While I was addressing the meeting in the Majestic Theatre referring to the loan a list of a considerable number of those who had received large commissions was handed me, and I read the list. Sir Michael has again suggested that the only name mentioned was that of his daughter. Sir Michael is again stating that which I have already denied, and in repeating the statement he is saying what he must know to be false. The entire list of the scores who received small amounts as just read by him in the House was not read by me, neither was such a list handed me. I was not interested in the payments of $5.00 or $50.00; I was interested in the payments of thousands of dollars, and as Miss Cashin had received from the Finance Office one of the largest amounts paid any broker or commission merchant in connection with the sale of bonds her name was read in conjunction with the names of a number of others who had received

large amounts. The statement that Sir Michael makes that her name was the only name referred to is absolutely incorrect.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—I was not at the meeting and do not know what you said, but her name was singled out in The Star newspaper.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I am not discussing what appeared during the course of the political campaign in any newspaper, whether supporting the present government or opposed to it; I am dealing only with the allegation made by Sir Michael Cashin that Mr. Brownrigg and myself singled out the name of his daughter, Miss Mary Cashin, and referred to her only as a broker or commission merchant who had received a large sum of money from the Treasury in connection with the sale of Government bonds. Sir Michael Cashin says that some lists were held back. I know of no lists being held back; the list that I read was the list of the people who had received the large amounts and his daughter's name was one of the list. I did not have any list of the multitude of small amounts which Sir Michael has just read, and if I did have it I would not have wearied a public audience by reading it. Sir Michael has said that there was a suggestion of wrong doing on the part of his daughter in connection with the saie of these bonds. Ihave heard of no such suggestion. So far as I know, so far as I have read in the papers, so far as I have heard on the street, there is absolutely nothing more and nothing less in the transaction than that an arrangemen was made by Sir Michael Cashin, then Minister of Finance and Customs, with his daughter under which certain bonds which might have been sold direct by the Finance Office were sold by Sir Michael through his daughter, Miss Mary Cashin, who made the usual brokers commission for herself on the transactions. It is not suggested that she received from the Finance Office a bigger commission than was paid any other broker or was paid any banker or other person who dealt in Government bonds.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—I, too, Mr. Speaker, fail to see why Miss Cashin should have been chosen as the victim of this piece of misrepresentation. This was a legitimate amount paid according to an arrangement practically passed by this Assembly and anybody might have received it, as indeed many did, who complied with the provisions of that arrangement. This thing, Sir, should go before the public in its true light so that the wrong already done by the mis-statement of the facts might be set right. I know people who pooled together in buying these bonds in order to get the discount, and there was nothing wrong about it because, as I have stated before, the thing was practically passed by this legislature. I do not think for a moment that the Prime Minister would want to do Miss Cashin a personal injury but nevertheless the matter was placed before the public in a very unfair manner.

Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs in the absence of Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries tabled answer to question asked by Mr. Vinnicombe, as follows: "If Mr. Holwell, fish warden, had been dismissed. If so, for what cause, and if anyone has been appointed in his place."

Petitions were presented by Mr. Abbott from Canaile re public wharf; Mr. MacDonnell, from Bay of Islands, re ferry; Mr. Winsor, from Safe Harbor, re roads; Mr. Hibbs, from Fogo, re landing place; Mr. Hibbs, from Joe Batt's Arm, re public wharf; Mr. Hibbs, from Seldom Come Bye, re road.

Pursuance to notice and leave granted and on motion of the Hon. the Prime Minister the bill entitled "An

Act to confirm a Contract between the Government and the St. Lawrence Steamship Pulp and Lumber Company, Ltd.," was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. Mr. Foote the bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 183 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Management and Control of the Harbor of Grand Bank'" was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs to table a statement showing cost of loan of $6,000,000 passed by this House May 8th, 1919.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the bill entitled "An Act for the Better Obtaining of Information respecting the Codfishery" 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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the bill entitled "An Act to Incorporate the Women's Patriotic Association of Newfoundland" 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.

Honourable the Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled "An Act to Regulate the Exportation of Codfish."

Sir John Crosbie gave notice of question.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, May 11th, 1920.

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

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from quite a number of the trap owners of Pouch Cove in the District of St. John's East in reference to a matter that has of late been occupying the attention of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, namely, the drawing of trap berths. This petition requests first that the drawing for berths in that particular section be deferred for a year, and secondly that the Pouch Cove and Bicayan Cove voters be "pooled" for a common drawing. This latter request, in the light of the peculiar circumstances, is, I think you will admit, is, a reasonable one. The position is this. Biscayan Cove, which is practically a part of Pouch Cove, has ten prime berths, while there are only four trap owners there to draw for them, and what is asked is that the remainder of these berths be thrown open to the Pouch Cove men. Little need be said in an explanatory way as the matter is already one of which the department has already some knowledge but I would ask the immediate attention of the minister himself be given to this petition because it is made in good faith by these hardworking and industrious fishermen and because if it is not found practical to defer the drawing it might at least be found practical to combine, as it were, the waters of Biscayan Cove and Pouch Cove, or in other words give the trap men of Pouch Cove and Biscayan Cove a prior right to set berths in that section which embraces the two places. I think it will be conceded that if the drawing takes

place the bona fide residents of the cove itself should have the preference to the berths, and I say this so that our friends on the North Shore who cross over for the fishing season there will understand that the men who are on the spot and actually living and rearing their families on the St. John's East shore will be given first chance to secure berths in their own waters. I have no doubt that the Fisheries Department will see that the petitioners get fair play. I appreciate, of course, the difficulties with which the department is faced in grouping up these berths and having them drawn for, but in asking that this matter be given the earliest consideration of the department I would point out that the necessity for this exists in the fact that some decision must be arrived at before the proclamation governing the drawing of berths be issued.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the petition presented by my learned colleague, and I also ask that the department give the matter its immediate and active consideration. The question is an important one and I think when all the facts are taken into account there will be little doubt about this reasonable request being granted.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—Mr. Speaker, I wish to give this petition my fullest support and in doing so I would suggest that the Fishery Board might take into consideration the fact that this matter of arranging berths should be attended to, at least so far as this section is concerned, in the fall instead of in the spring for the reason that it would be a very great hardship on these hard working men after keeping their berths all the winter to lose them in the spring. In addition to the loss of the berths there would be the trouble and expense of changing their traps to make them either deeper or shoaler, as the case might be to suit the new berth. I think, sir, that such an arrangement would be most unfair to them and more particularly when they are all satisfied to have the matter settled as this petition requests.

HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—I would like to ask the hon. member for St. John's East if the place in question is not common fishing grounds for the people of Pouch Cove and Biscayan Cove.

MR. HIGGINS:—It has been in the main: The men from Pouch Cove have fished in Biscayan Cove waters but they were used exclusively by Biscayan Cove fishermen and in part by men from Pouch Cove. But the trouble is that in the summer seven or eight traps belonging to Bay de Verde people are laid down there between Shoe Cove and Biscayan Cove it is a great hardship to the people in that settlement as they have to go elsewhere. The same occurred last yeai at the Battery and the drawing was postponed for another year.

MR. MacDONNELL:— Notice of questions.

NOTICE OF MOTION.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:— to ask leave to introduce a bill entitled "and act to confirm a contract between the government and the Susu steamship company Ltd."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:— Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to withdarw that motion.

NOTICE OF MOTION.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES:—To ask leave to introduce a bill entitled "an act to regulate the exportation of codfish."

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:— on behalf of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries—I ask leave to withdraw that motion as it proposed to bring it in by recoultion of committee.

NOTICE OF QUESTIONS

ORDER OF THE DAY.

Committee of the whode on bill

entitled "An Act to amend chapter 172 of the consolidated statutes (third series) entitled "of the survey of foreign going and Labrador vessels."

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I move that this stand deferred owing to the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Second reading of bill entitled "an act to amend the Judicature Act."

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—In proposing an amendment to the judicature act I desire to say, although it may come as news to the members of this House lawyers fees for cases tried in court have been fixed by law. Owing to the high cost of living as leader of the bar I have been asked to present this bill. It consists of a higher scale and a lower scale, but I may say that the mere face of a scale beng here dosen't say that this amount will be paid. All clients who take their cases into court are entitled to have the bill taxed. If the amount s too high he may take it to the register who will reduce it. This is similar to the English scale only t is not so high. It is also found necessarw that an increase be made in the scale of fees for a witness.

Today a witness is paid 75 cents and he makes every effort to staw away from court with the result that the administration of justice meets with many obsticles on thic account. The most important of all is the scale of fees to sherffs and process servers. Many deputy sheriffs get 50 cents for serving a writ and 25 cents for every mile over two miles, with the result that sometimes a whole morning s spent in serving a writ for this amount and there is great difficulty in keeping sheliffs on the list. Therefore I ask an increase and if not lone I fear it will be impossible to get a writ served.

MR. HIGGINS:—I rise to second that motion and I may be able to corrobate the statements of the Hon. Minister of Justice having actual experience of the facts as they are today.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to uresent a petition from the residents of Point LeHayse, P.B., asking for the sum of $200 to repair a road leading from the main road over to Holyrood Pond. This road is a very important one for the reason that all the fence material used by the people of that place as well as the material used for fishery purposes such as stages, flakes, etc., and the material used n several small mills has to be hauled over it and it is therefore imperative that something should be done to keep t in good condition. I might point out, sir, that since this road was made there has been no provision made for repairs to it and it has had to depend on small sums that might be devoted to its up-keep from special grant. The same thing applies all over the districe, there being, in many cases, no provision whatever for main roads. I trust the Minister of Publc Works will find it convenient to consult with the different representatives of dstricts with a view to increasing the grants for main line roads all over the country as the grants are at present hopelessly inadequate. There are in some sections main line roads of from five to eight miles long for which there is no provision whatever for maintenance out of the main line grants. I hope, sir, that before the estimates go thru this matter will receive serious consderation as there is no time like the present to deal with important matters of this kind.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Speaker, I give this petition my hearty support for the reasons outlined by my colleague, Mr. Sullivan, and I also endorse his request that the representatives of the various districts be consulted with in order to have the annual grant read-

justed to meet the growing demands of main line roads which have built from time to time from special grants. There are fifteen such in Placentia district and some of them have railway connections. A few have been added to the list o fthose receiving a share of the annual grant, but there are still a number of wrich no provision has been made and now when the estimates are about to be brought in is the time for something to be done.

MR. SINNOTT:—Mr. Speaker, I also have much pleasure in giving this petition my hearty support.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Walsh gave notice of question.

Mr. MacDonnell gave notice of puestion.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Terenceville, F. B., asking for a sum of money to complete a pier and breakwater which is now unde construction. In presenting this petition I wish to give it my fullest support and I might point out that Terenceville will in the near future be the terminus of the branch railway, the line for which has already been surveyed and promises, therefore, to be a flurishing settlement.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Cupids asking for a modification in the present prohibition law. This petition is signed by 160 names which are certified by two prominent residents o fthe place, Abram LeDrew and James LeDrew. As I have already asked the prime minister what is the intention with regard to this matter and been informed by him that the government has come to no decision, I would ask that this petition be allowed to stand over until the matter comes up before the House.

M. ABBOTT:—Mr. Speaker, 1 ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of St. Brendan's asking for the sum of $250 to repair a road leading from Shoal Cove to Shalloway Cove, known as Hall's Road. They also ask for a sum of $250 to repair another road leading from Hayward's Cove to the cemetery, known as Dock Cove Road. This petition is signed by partically all the electore of St. Brendan's and I trust the government wlli give their request the fullest consideration. I ask sir, that this petition be refered to the Department of Public Works, and hope that it will be given the consideation that it deserves.

MR. WINSOR:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support the prayer of this petition and I trust that the government will see its way clear to grant the sums asked for to make these very necessary repairs.

Sir J. C. Crosbie asked the Minister of Justice if Magistrate Mifflin of Greenspond had been transferred. If so, why? And to state to what place Mr. Mifflin had been trans ferred and what will be the nature of his duties.

Sir J. C. Crosbie asked the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs if the postmistress at Squid Tickle, B.B., Miss A. Burden, has been dismissed. If so, why? Has any charge been made against her? If so to lay a copy of such charge on the table of the house.

On motion the notices respecting the bills entitled "An Act to confirm a contract between the Government and the Susu Steamship Co., Ltd.," and "An Act to regulate the exportation of codfish," were withdrawn.

Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to move the House into a committee of the whole to consider certain resolutions regarding the exportation of codfish from this colony.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Judi-

cature Act" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, "An Act to confirm a contract between the Government and the St. Lawrence Steamship Pulp & Lumber Company Ltd." was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole House on to-morrow.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:— Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this bill in confirmation of a contract between the government and the St. Lawrence Timber, Pulp and Steamship Company, I would observe that this contract is not one for which the present administration is primarily responsible. During the year 1919 negotiations were pending between the late government and the company with respect to this matter. The arrangements had not been completed when the late government was defeated on the third of November last, and shortly after their defeat at the polls and before they resigned from office a minute of council was passed under which an agreement was concluded. The document gives evidence on the face of it of being hurriedly drafted and not fully considered in the interests of the Colony. It was signed by the company, the great seal affixed thereto, and forwarded to His Excellency the Governor for signature. The document contained certain sections which were in direct conflict with the 1919 act relating to the exportation of timber, and as the administration responsible for the minute of council had in the meanwhile retired from office, the document came before the present executive government for consideration, as the completion of its execution was a matter for which the present Government would be responsible. A perusal of the contract disclosed the fact that in eseveral particulars the interests of the Colony had not been protected as fully as in the opinion of the present administration they should be protected, and it was also thought that the concessions with respect to the exportation of pitprops should be reduced. As a result of the refusal of the Executive Government to undertake responsibility for the completion of the execution of the document and act of confirmation of the contract in the form in which it was passed by the late administration, there was a series of conferences between representatives of the company, the Attorney General, the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, and myself, in the hope that this legacy of the late administration might be put into a form which would not be entirely objectionable to the Government and at the same time acceptable to the company. After a considerable number of conferences this was accomplished. The size of pitprops permitted to be exported was reduced; the section relating to fredom from certain general taxation was modified; a section was added providing for the appointment by the Government of an inspector to see that the provisions of the contract were carried out by the company; the salary of the inspector to be paid by the company; a provision was inserted to the effect that the fredom from taxation on securities, etc., applied only in the event of the company not making a profit of seven per cent.; a provision was inserted calling for the continued operation of the company's pulp and paper enterprise, and various other restrictions necessary in the interests of the Colony were included in the contract.

Hon. The Prime Minister (Continued.)

The result is that I am now in a position to submit to this House for

confirmation a contract which while in the matter of the exportation of piptrops is not strictly in harmony with the general policy of the administration is nevertheless a contract which may be regarded as reasonably satisfactory in the general interests of the Colony; a contract which is certainly very much superior to the contract approved of by the late administration. The bill is not in any sense of the word a party measure. The contract itself is a legacy of the late administration. In the form in which it was when the present Government took charge of affairs I would not be prepared to submit it for ratification to the legislature, but with the modifications which have since been made in the contract and concurred in by the company, I can recommend the contract to the House as worthy of its careful consideration and undivided support.

The St. Lawrence Timber, Pulp and Steamship Company is an English company incorporated under the laws of Great Britain and Ireland, with its registered office at Sheepbridge Works, Chesterfield, England. The company is strong financially, its directorate being a body of capable, wealthy English gentlemen who propose to develop on a small scale an enterprise at Lomond, in the district of St. Barbe, similar to the undertakings of the Anglo Newfoundland Development Company, Limited, at Grand Falls. For some time past they have been operating a saw mill in that neighbourhood and have already shown themselves to be a company which deals honorably and courteously with its employees and is prepared to operate its areas, not merely in the interests of immediate profit, but rather with a view to the development of valuable business undertakings of a permanent character.

The House will be interested to know that Dr. Grieve, who for so many years was prominently identified with the Grenfell undertakings in Newfoundland, has for some time past been the Newfoundland manager of the company, and I am quite sure that with the financial strength and responsibility of its directorate and under the able management of Dr. Grieve, the St. Lawrence Timber, Pulp and Steamship Company, Limited, will develop an important pulp, paper and timber enterprise in the Bonne Bay area, in the district of St. Barbe.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into a committee of the whole to consider certain resolutions respecting the lighting of streets in the outports.

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

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Speaker, in seconding the motion of adjournment, I wish to draw the attention of the Hon. the Prime Minister, in the absence of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, to what I consider to be an important matter. I just noticed now that another serious accident has happened on Bell Island, and I notice one of the victims has died, and the other is in a serious condition. Now I claim that there should be a competent man appointed immediately as inspector of mines. It is not good enough to be reading of these accidents happening on Bell Island, and some of them are caused because we have not a competent inspector, a man who is prepared to do his duty by the public, without fear or prejudice. I believe there is a man supposed to be doing some such work, and there should be an inquiry into this. A man should have to undergo a string-

ent examination before he is given charge of underground work, and explosives, and I speak as one fully qualified to speak on this matter, because I spent some years at this work. Mr. Hall may be a good man in his line. He may know something about the technical part of mining, but he knows nothing about the practical part of it. I bring this matter before the Prime Minister in the hope that steps will be taken immediately, to put in that department, some practical, competent man, and I submit that he should be given sufficient salary, so that he will be independent of any corporation, or company, and he will be able to safeguard the lives of the men who partake in this dangerous work.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, May 12, 1920

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

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Twillingate, Moreton's Hr. and Salvage, B.B., requesting the erection of a breakwater at Twillingate. Twillingate, although not a good natural harbor, is nevertheless a port of call for many southern vessels going up and down the coast and especially the Labrador vessels. The inhabitants frequently suffer heavy losses through property being damaged by storms. The harbor is exposed to ocean gales from east to north and very often vessels drive ashore there in these gales, and in many cases are total wrecks. These petitioners now ask for a sum of money to put a breakwater in the most suitable place so as to make the harbor, as far as possible, a safe one. There was a request before the government for the deepening of Shoal Tickle but this is being waived in favor of the breakwater. This is I can assure the house from actual knowledge of the facts, a long felt want and I trust when the request goes before the department of the Colonial Secretary, it will receive the attention that its impolrtance entitles it o.

MR. JONES:—I beg to suport this petition, Mr. Speaker, as I know the great need that exists for this breakwater. Twillingate, as you know, sir, is the principal place in the district and further than that, it is an important harbor in other respects. It could not be in a better position fot the convenience of passing vessels but unfortunately it affords very poor shelter and consequently, as Mr. Jennings has pointed out, numbers of vessels are driven ashore there each year. I think you, Mr. Speaker, will remember that only last year a Carbonear vessel was lost there. Now that the young men of the district are looking forward to the future for the improvement of the fiisheries they expect that something will be done to improve conditions. Moreover this breakwater will be in the interests of all the people along the east coast and more particularly to schooners going north and south. I have much pleasure therefore in giving this petition my hearty support.

MR. SAMPSON:—Mr. Speaker, as the junior member for Twillingate, I also desire to give this petition my hearty support. Twillingate as you know, sir, is the capital of the north and considering this fact as well as the size of the town and the amount of business being carried on there, a special effort should be made to make it a safe place not only for Twillingate vessels but for all the vessels on that coast. I therefore join sir, with my colleagues, in asking that this petition be given the best consideration.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave notice of question.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into a Committee of the whole to consider certain resolutions respecting a contract between the government and the Susu Shipping Company, Ltd.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked the Hon. Minister of Justice if the Royal Commission promised to be appointed some few days age to inquire into "The Woodford Affidavit" are yet in existance?. If so, kindly give the names of the commissioners and when they may proceed to business.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—A Royal Commission is being drafted. Chef Justice Horwood, Justice Kent and Hon. R. K. Bishop have been appointed and there is no reason why they should not proceed to business next week.

Mr. Walsh asked the Hon. Minister of public works if a contract has been made to continue the motor ferry service from Branch to St. Joseph's in St. Mary's Bay. Were tenders asked for contract, if so that a copy of all tenders be placed on the table of the House.

The information asked for was tabled.

Mr. MacDonnell asked the hon. the premier to lay on the table of the house all, or any, correspondence between the government and any parties in relation to the construction of a motor highway on the west coast, in the district of St. George's.

The Hon. Prime Minister—The correspondence is in course of preparation and will be tabled as soon as ready.

Mr. MacDonnell asked the minister of posts and telegraphs what price per hundred copies is being paid for the foreign news sheets mailed from the P. O. department to outport post offices not having telegraphic com-

[illegible]ication.

The Hon. Prime Minister—On behalf of the hon. minister of posts and telegraphs who is absent, I beg to say that this will be tabled as soon as possible.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked the hon minister of finance and customs to table a statement showing the number of men left this colony since May 1st, to date.

The information asked for was tabled.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked the minister of finance and customs to table a statement showing in detail the expenditure of loan six millions raised.

Minister of Finance & Customs—I will table a reply as soon as possible. It is now in course of preparation.

Pursuant to order and on motion of hon. the minister of marine and fisheries the house resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider the bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 172 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (third series) entitled 'Of the Survey of Foreign-going and Labrador Vessels.'"

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair.

HON.MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—In this bill entitled "Of the Survey of Foreign-going and Labrador Vessels," I would like to draw your attention to an alteration made since the second reading in Section 4 of the bill. After the word "survey" the word "has" is replaced by the word "have." This word has been substituted in order to compel people to have them surveyed. As pointed out in the past similar laws were made but were not lived up to as no penalties were provided for a breach of the act.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that I endorse this bill, and I think, as the hon. minister of marine and fisheries says, it is very necessary but I would like to see a clause inserted dealing with certificates of masters and mates.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—A bill is being prepared to cover this matter.

I also wish to endorse a suggestion that has been recommended to me, that the act should provide, that on any breach of the act by the ship owners, that their vessels should not be given clearance until the fine was paid. It should be made incumbent upon them to comply with the terms of this act. In this matter the department would be able to see that the regulations are carried out.

With regards to section 6. This section compels a surveyor to do his duty. Section 5 defines what he has to do, but it is one thing to define duties and another thing to have such duties carried out. He must not pass any vessel that is not sea-worthy. We are going to make it a crime for surveyor to pass any vessel that is unseaworthy and are going to punish them is he does not do his duty in this despect.

Now with regard to Section 5. We will also note that any vessel built in Newfoundland must be built under Schedule B. All vessele must be up to schedule or they will not get certificate. Schedule B. is the class we havebeen building to entitle the builder to the bounty. It is impossible now for a vessel to sail unless qualfied under Schedule B. so the owner or masters in future will have to ask for an inspection or be fined.

Regarding Section 12. The registrar of shipping will have deputies in the outports and the governor-in-council will work out with the registrar of shipping where the mark must go and he will instruct sub-collectors in the outports where the load line must be placed. Now I think that this is a desirable bill. It will not be very stringent on a vessel of good construction, but any vessel not seaworthy will not be allowed to sail from Newfoundland. The act has been gone into by Lloyd's surveyor and officials in my department and a committee of shipping, and we are doing all that we can to make it perfect and all seem to be satisfied with it.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—Mr. Chairman, I think what Mr. Fov said is very correct, because it will get over the difficulty you want to get over and save a lot of trouble; besides, that is a matter that you will hold a vessel up on quicker than by imposing a thousand dollar fine.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES:—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the point raised by the Hon. Mr. Fox, we will amend Section 5 and add a new paragraph this way, No such ship shall be cleared for any voyage by any customs officer for a foreign port until she shall have received such certificate of seaworthiness."

MR. FOX:—Mr. Chairman, in connection with that amendment would it not be better to say that No clearance shall be granted until the registar, or the official placed in charge, is satisfied that the requirements of the act would be carried out." This would not limit the application of the act, and if we recognize the necessity for putting in a clause this would make it as wide as possible.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—And the man in charge would get his share for the survey, I presume, and the master of the vessel would be able to carry his certificate with him to whatever port he would be bound.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES:— Certainly..

Mr. HIGGINS:—Mr. Chairman, with regard to this Section 7. Whilst I realize the idea, which seems, perhaps, to be a great hardship to discontinue a vessel that is not seaworthy, what is the point in allowing a vessel to run for twelve months, if she is not seaworthy. I think that

is too long. If a vessel is not fit to go, why let her go? You are giving a men a long period to jockey with a vessel that is unfit.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—I think it is a mistake to give too long a time Make it read for one trip.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES:—It is only meant for one trip. However, we shall make the section read "not more than six months." With regard to Section 9. How is 100 tons? Do you think we ought to make it 120.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—I think you are all right there, 100 tons is plenty.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES:—We intend to follow the imperial measure as far as possible. Reads Section 3 bill entitled "Of the survey of Foreign-going and Labrador Vessels."

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Now, is this bill "Of the survey of Foreign-going and Labrador Vessels" to come into force as soon as it is passed? How is this going to effect foreign-going vessels?

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—If this bill comes into effect after the passing of this measure there may be a hardship (Of the survey of foreign-going vessels).

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE—This measure (Of the survey of foreign-going and Labrador vessels) shall come into effect by proclamation and then sufficient time will be allowed.

MR. HIGGINS:—Why put the government in the position of having this bill (Of the survey of foreign-going and Labrador Vessels) come into effect by proclamation and then allowing a certain time?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—This act shall come into force six months after the passing of this measure. How would that be?

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—Maybe six months would be too long. Should come into force after August 31st. A lot of vessels have returned by then.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Come into force three months from the date of the passing of this act.

SIR JOHN C. CROSBIE: — Mr. Chairman, before this section 10 takes effect I would like to call the attention of the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the fact that I think there is some law on the statute book dealing with the survey of vessels going to Labrador. I also wish to point out to the Hon. Member that I know that this law is not carried out. Now we ought to see that this law is carried out as near as we can. At the present time the people sailing to Labrador do so in nothing short of floating stages. They are not treated like human beings at all and this is something we ought look into. I do not know much about the people going down shore fishing but I do not think this applies to people going fishing down in Bonavista and Green Bays. But in Conception Bay something must be done or else we will wake up some day because of some disastrous happening and then say how sorry we are. This can be avoided, and what I saw of it was enough. On one occasion I saw the Diana sail and the people aboard were treated in a most inhuman fashion. I think the Hon. Speaker of the House knows Conception Bay and he may be able to make so suggestions to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I make the appeal on behalf of the crews sailing from this place.

HON. THE SPEAKER:—I thank the Hon. Member for Port de Grave for giving me the opportunity to say a few words with regard to the conditions which obtain not alone on the Labrador vessels, vessels going from Conception Bay and the other bays of the Island, but also the conditions ex-

isting on the coastal boats, as alluded to by the Hon. Member. I do think, sir, that while the Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has had the courage to introduce so many bills of such far-reaching effect on the fishing population of this Dominion he ought to get up courage once more and introduce a bill grappling with this matter, the conditions which obtain around Conception Bay. Now there is quite a number of vessels going to Labrador to prosecute the voyage, that is the shore fishery, which belongs to a class of vessel which ought not to be used as such. These vessels are in that condition which the members of this house would call unseaworthy. These same conditions going to and from Labrador to prosecute the voyage, that is the shore fishery, which belongs to a class of vessel which ought not to be used as such. These vessels are in that condition which hte members of this house would call unseaworthy. These same vessels are up against the same conditions going to and from Labrador as they would be crossing the Atlantic. In the spring time when they prosecute the voyage they are up against ice and very bad storms and the same storms when the voyage is over. Some men have their entire family with them.

When the planter comes home in the fall he brings his voyage and very often a good part of his family. He takes all kinds of chances. The class of vessel used is not what this house would call seaworthy. There is a custom that when a vessel has served her day in other lines of work she is used to take people to and from Labrador. The people are glad to get there in anything, but we must do something to protect the people against themselves. The condition with respect to the coastal boats is often worse than the vessels. I have often left my place in the Straits on a boat with accommodation for 120 passengers with 300 people on board. I remember in one instance coming up on the Ethie. Dr. Grenfell was on the boat with me. The people crowded on and were placed in quarters not fit for cattle. I wane to the captain and objected to his taking any more people. We had men and women lying around everywhere, surrounded with all kinds of indecencies. It is a situation that this house should immediately take steps to remedy.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Chairman along the same lines that have been referred to by the hon. speaker I was talking to a captain of the conditions from the Straits to the terminus at Bonne Bay. The conditions are something frightful, as has been said, but it is not the captains fault. His hands are tied. The people get on the boats and are stowed away in every conceivable place. I recommend that the hon. minister of marine and fisheries take this matter up with a view to bettering this condition. On the second reading of the bill I thought it wise to make the bill applicable to all seagoing vessels. The same danger awaits the vessels in the coastal trade as those going far away from the coast.

MR. SCAMMELL:—Mr. Chairman, while we are on this subject I am glad to avail of the opportunity that has presented itself to me to make a few remarks with regard to the Humbermouth-Battle Harbour route, and I should be negligent in my duty to my constituents on that coast if I failed to embrace this opportunity. I am totally in accord with all that has been said by his hon. the speaker and by the hon. member for St. John's East. No one is in a better position than myself to speak of conditions that prevailed on that route last summer. I made two trips on the Ethie

and saw the overcrowding of freight and passengers at its worst. The condition of affairs that prevailed was absolutely outrageous and well nigh intolerable. Every spring there is the usual large number of fishermen going down the coast and returning in the autumn. This only aggravates conditions. The Ethie was entirely inadequate. The captain is not to blame for overcrowding passengers. People will come on board and cannot be prevented. The only solution is a boat of the Meigle type or like the Portia or Prospero.

The route is a long one, 400 miles, and nothing less than a boat of the type I have referred to can give an adequate service.

MR. MacDONNELL:—Mr. Chairman I have had some experience along those lines. I have made a couple of trips on this route, and have seen the conditions that the people have to contend with. Last year, in the fall, when I was at Bay of Islands, I found the coastal boat so crowded with passengers and the freight congestion so great that it would warrant this house taking action to see that these conditions would not occur again. As with the trains, tickets are sold sometimes amounting to 60 or 70 over the accommodation space. There is nothing to prevent the agent from doing this. With respect to the Ethie service the thing was absolutely mismanaged. At the outset she would take enough freight at Humbermouth to load. When she comes to Bonne Bay she is unable to take anything, although there is half a load there waiting. I have seen the freight piling up for three or four weeks, and when the Ethie came to Curling she was always loaded for Bonne Bay. When she arrived at Bonne Bay and discharged she had to go down the Straits empty. The service cannot be run on cast iron rules. Much must be left to the discretion of the captain. The result is that people beyond Bonne Bay, the people who most need the service, are entirely left out. The trouble is, people are making conditions to suit themselves. Why cant we right here make conditions the best possible for the greatest number of people?

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—Mr. Chairman, I understand that the Government is going to bring in some proposition with respect to the coastal service. If that is the intention this discussion will come in then.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—Full opportunity will be given to discuss this question.

SIR JOHN C. CROSBIE:—The Hon. Speaker has made the matter very clear. As he says, usually the vessels are out of date, they have been worn out in some other line of work. We have a law with respect to the survey of Labrador schooners but the law is not carried out. May I ask the hon. minister of marine and fisheries to attend to this matter, and see that the law is carried out.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES:—Mr. Chairman, with regard to the matter raised by the hon. member for Port de Grave, there is a law already on our statute book providing for the survey of Labrador vessels.

The inspector of shipping is appointed under this act to look after this survey but as there is no penalty provided it is impossible to have the law carried out. Now we can reconsider Section 4 of the bill before the chair and after the word "dollars" insert the following words, "This section shall apply to vessels engaged in any way in connection with the prosecution of the Labrador.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—Mr. Chairman, while this matter is under discussion, there is one point

that should not be lost sight of. While I am thoroughly in accord with what has been said by his honor the speaker, I want to point out that there is a certain class of people engaged in the Labrador fishery whose very livelihood depends on their getting down to that coast at a certain time in the spring and whose lives depend on their getting back at a certain time in the fall, and if you are going to do anything with regard to this matter it should first of all be decided whether or not under the improved conditions resulting from such a law as is here proposed, you can assure these people the necessary accommodation to take them back and forth, because if we cannot see our way clear to do this it is better to let things stand as they are, at least for the present.

MR. SAMPSON:—Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with what the minister of public works has said, and I, too, believe that we cannot alter the present condition of tnhigs till we have more vessels. As Mr. Jennings has said, these people must get down at a certain time and they must get back again in the fall before it is too late and until we have sufficient accommodation for them to do this under the improved conditions, we cannot risk making too radical a change.

HON. THE SPEAKER:—With regard to the conditions as they affect passenger traffic, if I remember correctly, there is already a law on the statute book providing for the survey of passenger accommodation on Labrador vessels, but not of the vessels themselves.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—Yes, but as the Hon. Minister has pointed out there is no penalty provided for in that law. I quite see the force of the remarks of the Minister of Public Works, but what His Honor the Speaker points out is that we should do the best we can with what vessels we have and make them as nearly fit as is possible under the circumstances for the accommodation of human beings. As he has also pointed out, fishermen often bring their families down to Labrador with them and present conditions should no longer exist. Whatever excuse there might be for such conditions existing on a sailing vessel, there is no excuse whatever for their existing on a steamer.

With regard to the past few years, as Mr. Scammell has pointed out, the war was on and it was difficult to provide any kind of shipping accommodation and we had to take what we could get, but now, what His Honor the Speaker and what I want to see is that the best possible is done with regard to the vessels we have. Surely if we are going to provide for the survey of vessels freighting fish across the Atlantic, we should also do something with regard to vessels freighting people to Labrador.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—There is one thing I should like to draw attention to. My hon. friend, Sir John Crosbie, is interested in Lloyds insurance, and I would like for him to let Lloyds know what we are doing in this bill with a view to bringing about a decrease in the rates on fish cargoes going across the Atlantic. If we could get a decrease in the rate of 2 per cent. it would mean a total average save to the Colony annually of $450,000.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—I hope to be going across the water shortly and I shall take the opportunity of pointing this matter out to Mr. Scott, Secretary of Lloyds, in the hope of getting this decrease, but Lloyds will want to be shown some proof of just what we are doing

Another point Mr. Coaker has brought to my mind and one which I hope has not slipped the memory of the government and which is now,

I presume, under the jurisdiction of the Minister of Shipping. The matter I refer to is the collision between the General Currie and the Portia at Marystown. I understand that Mr. Harris has taken his case into court and if attended to properly the policy of the Portia should cover the accident and the protest of Captain Connors should be looked after.

MR. GOSS:—I understand. Mr Chairman, that a bill is at present before the House in relation to the survey of foreign-going and Labrador vessels. I am well acquainted with Labrador vessels, and I know to-day from actual experience that the vessel of 30 or 40 or 50 years ago was a far better class of ship than the Labrador vessel of today. I understand that vessels going to the Labrador are surveyed and classified to suit the insurance inspector It is also under- that the government inspector it to see that these vessels do not go down to the Labrador with far too many men than they are able to carry, but in accordance with their tonnage allowing so many men per ton. I myself have always sent ten or twelve crews down to the Labrador on one schooner each year, but I have a customs officer on board to survey the vessel.

Refeiring to the coastal boats I have heard men say who travelled back from the Labrador on some of these steamers that they would rather pay a higher rate for their passage and come back on one of my schooners, because they can't eat or sleep on board one of them, and if she has the misfortune to ground on a rock, wel, you might as well jump overboard. Newfoundlanders who go down to the Labrador don't want to be caught on a rock, neither do they want the government to hold them back because the vessel on which they are bound has not passed the inspection of a surveyor. If the matter of vessels sailing out of St. John's is brought up Lloyds and everybody else knows that they make one or two trips and perhaps sail out twenty or fifty or a hundred or two hundred miles and then drop right down and the crews return by ocean-going steamers. But sir, up on the Labrador the practical seaman can almost smell a breeze springing up and they get in out of it before the storm breaks.

To-day, sir, it is impossible to buy first class vessels. Men can't aord it. Sometimes I feel like not sending any schooner to the Labrador because they are old, but I can't afford to buy first class new vessels and send them there. I think the present law is quite sufficient to insure owners of ships from sending vessels that are unseaworthy to the Labrador, having in view the fact that they are at first subjected to inspection by the insurance people. If a vessel was not seaworthy it wouldn't be insured.

With regard to foreign-going vessels I think all possible should be done to discontinue the practice of sending vessels that are inadequate for the service across the water with our fish. The Nova Scotian and local built soft wood vessels cannot do the work that the English vessel could do. They generally make one or two voyages and that's the end of them. But, in the Labrador vessels I don't think that it is possible to make any improvement at present.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider the bill entitled "An Act to amend the Judicature Act."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs 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 ti was ordered that the said bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider the bill entitled "An Act to confirm a contract between the Government and the St. Lawrence Timber, Pulp and Steamship Company, Ltd. "

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of committee.

MR. MacDONNELL:—In spite of the short notice I got regarding the condition of this bill I wish to support it, in this respect, that it is a bill which stands for the development of the natural resources of our country. Too long we have had our natural resources bound up. Too long have we had property, timber property, in this country, in the hands of speculators. I hope and trust that this is the beginning of a line of action on the part of the Government. to have the crown lands act enforced or remodelled, as it finds necessary. I have a particular reason for supporting this bill, and it is in connection with that, that I ask for particulars with regard to certain correspondence.

I know that this company which I had in mind when I made that statement yesterday, are prepared, if given concessions, the same as we have given to the St. Lawrence Steamship, Pulp & Lumber Co., to give something in return. Now I know that this company, in so far as that they are going to operate in this country, will give returns for the concessions granted them, in the amount of money expended, but the company that I had in mind for the same considerations, are prepared to do the same thing, the promotion of new industries, and over and above that they are prepared to construct over two hundred miles of roadway twenty feet wide, starting from Deer Lake.

I know that this matter was put before the late government, and I know that there was an idea that the government was favorable to it. In my district, while I did not promise that the government would do anything in this matter, I did promise that I would give my support to it in this House. I have, sir, in my possession, petitions which I shall present in a few days, petitions which I could not present in the ordinary ruling to speak for five minutes. They come from every section of Bay St. George and Bay of Islands, signed by every man in the district, asking that the government take into consideration this matter which should have been done a year and a half ago, when the people spoke their approval of that action. The late government, to my mind, showed a lack of respect for the opinion of the district in that matter, and I believe now that the same forces which influenced them to take that action, are at work, to induce the present government to disregard the interests of the people. We have some men here in St. John's who go salmon fishing to the west coast in the summer. There are a few of them who believe that they will be injured if these concessions are given. One of the things they are prepared to see given is a prescriptive right to these rivers. Down in that district there are thirty rivers, and thirty pools in each river, and there is one river four miles from home, with thirty or forty pools, and they want seventy pools out of six or nine hundred, and because some gentleman thinks he might want to go to

one of these, we must remain in the backwoods for ever.

I know that this company is prepared to spend the money that should have been spent long ago. They are prepared to build two hundred miles of road, on these conditions, and what they have asked, has been granted by the people who own it. I don't see, sir, that the one section of the country where there is a future, should be hung up because of a number of people who think their pleasures may be inrefered with. There is at present no prescriptive right to the salmon pools, but men come here from Canada, and the United States, and put up their camps by a certain pool, and we dare not go and fish in that pool, because they would drive us out of it. These men benefit the country immensely. They pay ten dollars a year rod tax, but when a company comes in and offers to do things which should have been done twenty years ago, we see them hung up, see the whole matter delayed, because some people are not prepared to give the men who are prepared to gove something in return, the same rights which they give to a wool merchant, or a junk merchant from Halifax, who gives in return ten dollars a year. I wish I had a copy of the correspondence in this matter.

A dual offer had been made in a petition signed by every man in the district t ogive them the considerations regarding the pools, and if they are prepared to give that which is their own, I fail to see why the government which stands for reform, which stands for advancement, should stand in the way of the development of our natural resources.

Another proposition on the lines of this bill here is read, and I believe has come before the executive. They are prepared, besides building that road, to put up factories, furniture facorties, for the use of the timber which they already own by purchase. They are prepared to put up a wharf in the harbor of St. George's, so that several steamers can lie along side at one time. How much money would it take to build a wharf like that? We could not do it in a hundred years.

We have been ignored in the past. At the present moment it would be too big a tax upon the government to expect them to do this thing at once, but I hope that no attempt will be made by any hon. gentleman on the government side to consider or advise a "dog in the manger" policy and to retard that which you cannot do yourselves and to refuse others the opportunity of doing it. I shall take the opportunity before this House closes to present those bona fide petitions asking that the government immediately take up this business, although I do not know whether I am entitled to present those petitions from this side of the House, seeing that they involve an expenditure of public monies. I took action this year in order that this government may see the undoubted sins of the past government in this respect and that would be their excuse in pursuing their line of action. I took action to see that the petitions were again signed up and I have a batch of them on my desk now, including upwards of two thousand signatures. I will present them when I get a complete listin.

If it is desirable for the development of this country to give those rights to the St. Lawrence, Timber, Pulp and Steamship Company, Ltd., I cannot see that we should keep back the same rights from a similar company, who are prepared to give up in return two hundred miles of a road, to keep it cleared and built up and hand it over to the government after four years as a present. That road would be twenty feet wide and would cost ten thousand dollars a mile. It would extend from Deer Lake to Little River, as I have al-

ready said, and it must go along through the valleys and the rivers and would open up the best line in this country, and if it's worth while to have the country opened up thru that part of the country which advancement must come, I think it is a golden opportunity that should not be missed and which, I believe, will not be missed. I know that there are gentlemen in this House who have expressed themselves against this proposition, because of granting the use of thirty pools out of nine hundred. Now there is no man in this House or in this country more opposed to preservation, or more entitled to be opposed to preservation, than I am. I saw the operation of preserves and I know something about them. I saw and studied the present day limits, which were given to those who gave nothing in return, except that they wrung the heart's blood out of the people. I am prepared to support any project submitted by any body of representative men from any section of this country, as I believe every district should be given its proper share in the administration of affairs, and, I am sure, that the same gentlemen now sitting on the other side of the House will be fair-minded enough to see that such a measure as the one I have referred to, yoes through at the present session. I say at the present time because the matter is urvent. I know that a survey has been made and that work has started across the Reid Newfoundland Co's blocks, and I know that if this thing is put through that sufficient money can be deposited in any bank in this country to show that the company can fulfil its obligations. Up to now, not only were the company not encouraged in their enterprise, but received a kind of a laugh and a sneer. This is all the reply and response that has been given to a matter of any straight argument or force. The acquiring of lands that any man can buy for thirty cents an acre was one of the concessions asked for. Timber lands they wanted none, as they got enough. They wanted certain rights with regard to mineral lands and these are all the things they were looking for.

With regard to mineral lands, any claims that they take up they want to work immediately, but that may not be advantageous to some gentlemen who come here for three or four weeks in summer and who have claims up on the west coast and which they hold for eighty or á hundred dollars a year until they get somebody in to buy them. For years past it has been known that certain gentry whose friendship with the agriculture and mines department has enabled them to jump claims. I know the words I am using and I can furnish proofs. That line of conduct may suit them, but it does not suit us. I know that we have had geologists down here the past two or three years and they know of claims that were not paid for and they are prepared to pay royalties and to work them in conjunction with this 200 mile of a road that I speak of if given the rights so to do.

Here is an opportunity for this government putting the west coast ahead two hundred years. They may take it if they like. I shall, before this House closes, present these petitions and I shall put myself square with the people, and if the ekort that attended the men in this matter is futile, then when the time comes for the people to have a voice and a say in this respect they will be able to blame those responsible for such an action and I hope I shall be able to tell them a story in a way that they will not misunderstand.

Therefore, I am in thorough accord with this bill, because it grants privileges to a company who are prepared to develop, what odds what the company is or who the company is, so long as it means the development of this

country; and I hope that other hon. gentlemen will take a similar position that I ake when a similar question, under similar circumstances, arises concerning my district.

With reference to the statement made by the Prime Minister, did I understand him to say that a guarantee must be given that $1,000 industry must be established or that a half dozen industries the accumulated value of which would be say $3,000,000. Is this the principle?

HON. THE PREMIER:—This contract is, as I have already said, a legacy from the late Government. Under this contract permission is given to export certain quantities of that that permitted under the 1919 act, which is the general law of the country. If any company has a proposition which would mean the expenditure of millions of dollars in the Colony the Government would be glad to give consideration to the granting to it of reasonable concessions, but each proposition must be laid before the Government in a concrete form with definite information as to the financial strength behind it before the matter of concessions would be considered. I would point out that the late Government agreed to this company's exporting pit props larger in size than is specified in the contract now being considered by the House. The maximum size of pit props which the late government agreed to permit this company to export was six and a half inches. That was reduced by us to six inches.

MR. MACDONNELL:—Well I understand that this House passed six and a half inches and when it went to the upper house they made it six inches.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I am not prepared to state whether the act in the form in which it passed the House of Assembly provided for six and a half inches, but I do know that the bill as it passed the legislative council, of which I was then a member, limited the size to six inches. As I have already explained, under the contract approved by the late Government the pit props which the company was permitted to export consisted of a percentage not exceeding twelve of pit props exceeding six inches, but not exceeding six and a half inches in diameter, and twenty of pit props exceeding five and a half inches but not exceeding six inches in diameter, in both cases the diameter being measured at the top or thinner end. The present Government did not concur in this general policy; they thought that the company was being permitted to export unmanufactured wood of too large a size, but the contract had been made by the late Government; there was a minute of council authorizing its execution; the contract was signed by the St. Lawrence Timber, Pulp and Steamship Company and the great seal of the Colony had been affixed thereto, though it had not actually been signed by His Excellency the Governor. Negotiations were entered into with the company, conferences being held between the company's solicitor, the Attorney General, Dr. Grieve, the company's representative, the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, and myself, as a result of which the company agreed to reduce the maximum size in each case by half an inch.

MR. MacDONNELL—That point I wish to make to the Prime Minister is that if any class of people were in similar circumstances, if the same guarantees were given, will the same consideration be given them? I would like to say that if this is not so why make special legislation for one company? The other day we did the same thing when rebates were granted

half dozen companies. I hope this is not an instance of it again. I think we ought to get right here an assurance that warrants our support to this bill, (re confirmation of contract for export of pit props, etc.)

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—All that I can say in answer to my honorable friend is that any company which lays before the Government a bona fide proposition for the expenditure of a large sum of money for important developments in Newfoundland will have its proposition carefully considered and investigated, and every concession consistent with the best interests of the Colony will be granted. As to whether any particular concessions would be given will depend entirely upon the whole proposition. I feel that the member for St. George's has in mind the concessions to which he has already referred in reference to the district of St. George's. In that connection I would say that there is no person associated with the Government who desires to impede in any the development of the district of St. George's. We are all desirous of encouraging the development of that important and populous section of the island but up to the present no proposition which the Government as a body of sane business men can reasonably consider has been submitted. As soon as any gentlemen of financial strength either personally or through their duly accredited representative, lays a proposition before the Government in the interests of St. George's or any other section of the island it will, I can assure the honorable gentleman, receive every consideration.

MR. MacDONNELL:—I can assure you, sir, you will not have to wait for a solicitor to come along, but I will see that the cards are laid upon the table pretty soon.

MR. SULLIVAN:—I take it that no concessions are being asked for in this bill (re the confirmation of a contract for the exportation of pit props, etc.,) down to and including clause 9, but I hope that it is a reputable concern that is getting this contract through. I think it is a great movement because back in the old days we were the first to take this kind of a step in this country and before Quebec, and it is regrettable that legislation allowed the exportation of wood in the past in its raw state. Anyway I suppose it was necessary to make the deal and it is no use to criticize it now. But I do not see why such great quantities in the dimensions mentioned in this bill should be exported in its raw state. If this timber was converted it would practically mean twenty times as much labor in this country and would leave more money in the country. I do not think there will be any great export of pit props from this country in the future for the simple reason we are so far away and then again the rates from Scandinavia are cheaper. I think there is no necessity to worry over this bill. The other concessions granted to the company are all right.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Chairman, could my honorable friend, the member for St. Georges, tell me the name of the American company to which he has referred.

MR. MacDONNELL:—The Company has not yet been incorporated.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I know nothing of any representations having been made to the government directly or indirectly, on behalf of any American company or corporation with respect to the construction of a road on the West Coast. Mr. W. H. Taylor and many residents of St. George's were in communication with the late government and also with the present administration. This correspondence was based upon the sup-

position that certain wealthy gentlemen of the United States were prepared to make large investments in certain sections of the District of St. George's in consideration of certain timber, mining, agricultural and fishery concessions, but up to the present the Government has not been approached by any such capitalists, nor by anybody on their behalf. When the copies of the correspondence which my hon. friend has already asked to be tabled in this regard are before him he will recognize the soundness of the attitude of the Government in this connection.

MR. MacDONNEL:—Do I understand that they refuse to furnish the money?

HON THE PRIME MINISTER:—Nobody refused to furnish any money as nobody was asked to furnish any. The Government does not know who the parties are that propose to furnish the money. Some little time ago the local solicitor for Mr. W. H. Taylor, who claimed to represent certain undisclosed American principals, was asked for information as to who these principals were, and what was their financial standing. Other than a list of names of gentlemen who resided in the United States no information has been forthcoming.

MR. MacDONNELL:—I understand there have been several solicitors interested in this matter.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Yes. From a perusal of the correspondence I gather that the Hon. Donald Morison was the first solicitor interested in this matter. He made a proposition to the late government. That proposition did not receive favourable consideration. Last autumn Mr. Morison left Newfoundland for the winter and after he left, Mr. Leo Carter, as solicitor for Mr. Taylor wrote the present administration with respect to the same matter as that referred to by the Hon. Donald Morison in his correspondence with the late Government.

MR. MOORE:—Mr. Chairman, I notice in this bill that pit props shall not exceed six inches in the top whereas the bill that passed this House last year said six inches in the butt. Is there any reason for the change now?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Ferryland is correct when he states that the 1919 act relating to the exportation of timber limited the size of pit props to be exported to a maximum of six inches in diameter at the butt or thicker end. That act provided that the Government in Council might grant licenses for the exportation of round timber previously barked and sawn square at both ends subject to the condition that the licensee must own and operate a pulp or paper mill and a saw mill used in preparing pulp wood for the licensee's pulp or paper mill. As this company has a saw mill and proposes to erect a pulp and paper mill it would not be necessary for any special contractual relationships to be created in connection with the exportation of pit props if it were not for the fact that a part of the pit props to be exported exceed the diameter provided for by the general law of the Colony. Under the 1919 act the pulp or paper mill must have represented a capital expenditure of not less than $200,000. In this particular instance the capital expenditure would be not less than $1,000,000.

MR. MOORE:—Could any other company get the same privileges extended them as this company?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—This contract is a legacy which the present Government received from the late administration, and the section of it relating to the exportation of

pit props does not represent the considered policy of the present government in connection with the exportation of such manufactured timber. The present general policy of the administration in this regard does not exceed the export privileges set forth in the 1919 act. If, however any company is prepared to undertake the expenditure on capital account of millions of dollars in this country for the development of large pulp and paper operations, the Government is ever prepared to take into consideration the special circumstances in connection with such large expenditures and consider the granting of special concessions.

MR. MOORE:—If they spent fifty thousand dollars, would that entitle them to export?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—The expenditure of $50,000 is only a quarter of the expenditure called for in the 1919 act. If any company is prepared to undertake the expenditure of millions the Government would be inclined to grant them every reasonable concession.

MR. MOORE:—I understand when this pit prop bill went before the Upper House last year the size of pit props to be exported was reduced from six to five and a half inches.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—My recollection is that the original bill of last session gave a maximum of six and a half inches which was afterwards reduced to six. By reference to the bill my hon. friend will see that the maximum in the bill is six inches and not five and a half as suggested.

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 the report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the said bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Mr. Foote the bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 183 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled "Of the Management and Control of the Harbor of Grand Bank" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole House on to-morrow.

HON. MR. FOOTE:—Mr. Speaker, the object of this bill is to increase the personnel of the board of management of the harbour works at Grand Bank and to give them the power to impose certain taxes on ships entering that port, which taxes must be approved by the Governor in Council and which will be devoted to harbour improvements. The board will also be empowered, under this amendment to levy a tax of 20 cents per ton on all coal being imported into Grand Bank. The board will be increased from five members to seven. With this brief explanation, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the second reading of the bill.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House then adjourned till 3 o'clock to-morrow.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, May 13th, 1920.

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

MR. HIBBS:—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the people of Fogo asking that a more

modern post office be erected in that place.

The petitioners point out that as Fogo is a distributing centre for all mail matter on Fogo Island, that the present office is not sufficiently commodious to cope with the work, and they ask that a suitable building be erected on the grounds near the court-house, which is centrally situated and near the site where they hope to build a public wharf, later on. I saw this post office last fall and noted the conditions under which the work was being performed, and I think an effort should be made at the earliest possible moment to erect an office capable of handling the mail matter and worthy of the important little town of Fogo.

I heartily and sincerely support the prayer of this petition and ask that the matter be referred to the proper department where I hope it will receive the consideration its importance merits.

MR. HIBBS:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Fogo asking for the sum of $3000.00 for the purpose of erecting a public wharf. The wharf at this place was destroyed some years ago, and since then the people of Fogo have suffered a great disadvantage on that account. Fogo is one of our most important outport towns and has rather a large amount of traffic and commerce, and is certainly deserving of much better facilities in this respect than that which it at present obtains.

The wharf at which the steamer now lands is situated quite a distance from the post office and the people ask that a suitable wharf be built on the property adjoining the court house grounds which is central and most convenient to the travelling public.

I know the need of this wharf is very urgent and I have much pleasure in giving the matter my heartiest support and hope that the Government will see its way to allocate a sum of money for this important purpose.

I ask that the petition be received and referred to the department of marine and fisheries for consideration.

MR. HIBBS:—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present ap etition from the residents of Joe Batt's Arm asking for the small sum of $50.00 for the purpose of digging a public well. The people of Joe Batt's Arm in common with the people of other sections of Fogo district suffered in the past because of the lack of a pure water supply, I know of no place in the dominion where the people are so handicapped in this respect as in that section from Tilting to Fogo, as well as several settlements on the Straight Shore. I have given the matter a great deal of consideration in the hope of finding some way of solving this very distressing problem. I believe the best and most economical means of securing water in this section, where the ground is of a brick formation is by the use of a well boring drill. I intend to submit the cost of one of those outfits to the Government within a few days, as I think the purchasing of such a drill would be a very feasible proposition, as no doubt thereare many other sections throughout the country where it could be used to obtain water at much less cost than blasting wells. particularly through rock.

The Bell Island mining companies informs me that they have found the drill a very effective means of securing water.

The Nova Scotia provincial government have fourteen of such drills in use, and I hope we will be able to get at least one of these outfits this year.

I know the hardships which those

people have to undergo for the want of pure water, which in the past has no doubt been the cause of the outbreaks of typhoid fever in parts of the district.

For this reason I heartily support this petition and ask that it be sent to the department to which it relates.

MR. HIBBS:—Mr. Speaker, I also beg leave to present a petition from the Society of United Fishermen and others of Seldom-Come-By in the district of Fogo, asking for the modest sum of $50.00 to build a road to the S. U. F. Hall.

I distinctly remember passing this way last fall and finding it difficult to navigate the foot path over rocky ledges which are positively dangerous at night.

The proposed road would be a source of benefit to a great number of people, and as the sum asked is a very small one indeed I feel sure the government will see its way to grant the prayer of the petitioners.

I earnestly suppoort this request and ask that this petition be also referred to the department of public works for attention.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Mr. Speaker. I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Cupids asking that the present prohibition law as it stands be made more stringent. I have 72 names signed to this petition. In the petition that I presented yesterday for the modification of the act 16 names were appended.

THE HON. PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to table estimates of the revenue and expenditure of the St. John's municipal board for 1920.

MR. MacDONNELL gave notice of questions.

HON. PRIME MINISTER tabled reply to question asked by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

HON. MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Smith's Hr., Stocking Hr., and Burlington asking that telephone connection be established between Burlington and Smith's Hr. This would be a great boon to the people of these places as it is now impossible to get even news of the mails without travelling a distance of 3 or 4 miles. It would also be a great benefit in many ways and I give it my heartiest support and ask that this petition be received and referred to the department of posts and telegraphs.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Bay L'Argent, on two subjects, the first being that another boat be sent to Fortune Bay. The present boat is not able to fill requirements and they ask that something be done about putting a decent boat in Fortune Bay. I found while canvassing the district last fall that the people were very much pleased with the Susu, and they would like to see her go there again. While it is not possible for the Susu to go there as she has to fill another contract made by the late Government I have given constant attention to this matter and I think I have at least arranged for a suitable steamer.

The other matter they petition about is for a continuance of the overland from Bay L'Argent to Baine Hr., Placentia Bay, and in presenting this petition I would like to say, that every effort is being made to detain the Hudson Bay Co. steamer at Fortune Bay, and I hope the Government will be successful in its efforts and I hope that the overland mail question will be given due consideration by the Government.

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled statement of estimates revenue and

expenditure of Municipal Council 1920.

Mr. MacDonnell gave notice of question.

Sir Michael Cashin gave notice of question.

Sir John Crosbie gave notice of question.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary if any correspondence has taken place between the Food Control Board and the wholesale sugar importers and control of same; also if the Control Board knows of any stock now stored in Canada awaiting shipment to Newfoundland.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, replying to the question of Sir Michael Cashin, I beg to state that I sent a copy of the order paper to the Chairman of the Food Control Board and he sent me a memorandum, saying that he would have the information to-morrow.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN asked the Hon. Minister of Public Works what amount of road money allocated to Ferryland district within the past six weeks giving the names to whom allocated, name of settlement, amount of each allocation, also if he is yet sending out the local road grants to the road boards.

HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—Mr. Speaker, replying to the question from Sir Michael Cashin, I beg to table the information requested.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister o fMarine and Fisheries bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 172 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled "Of the Survey of Foreign Going and Labrador Vessels'" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that 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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the bill entitled "An Act to amend the Judicature Act" 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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. the Prime Minister the bill entitled "An Act to Confirm a Contract between the Government and the St. Lawrence Timber Pulp and Steamship Company 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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Mr. Foote the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider the bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 183 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled "Of the Management and control of the Harbor of Grand Bank."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of committee.

Committee of the whole on bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 183 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled "Of the Management and Control of the Harbor of Grand Bank."

MR. MOORE:—Mr. Chairman, I would like the Hon. Mr. Foote who is in charge of this bill how many tons of coal are imported annually into Grand Bank?

HON. MR. FOOTE:—About 2000 tons.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The chairman from the committee

reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the bill with some amendment.

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

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Mr. Speaker, the answer I got to a question from the Hon. Minister of Public Works regarding the allocation of road money seems to me to be very evasive. The minister states that the money was allocated for the building of a retaining wall dam aged by a washout. I do not know of any washout that has occurred in Ferryland district. I think that the road money for that district should be sent out as quickly as possible, because the men are all getting ready for the fishery.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—I would like to know from the hon. gentleman if it is the intention of the Department of Public Works to dismiss those road boards and form new ones?

HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—The boards are at present in a disorganized condition. Some of the members are dead. In all probability new boards will be formed.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—I would like to know if you are prepared to take a recommendation in reference to those boards.

HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—As to some particular wants may be.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—I notice that in Aquaforte the late Henry Winsor was chairman of the Road Board there and now that he is dead the job was handed out to a young slacker recommended by one of my opponents and he was sent over the heads of the existing members of the board. If this is the policy of the so-called reform government it is only a nickname on the present Government. The time has arrived when the members should see that the money is sent. I want to see a road board there.

HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—I might say in reply to the honourable the leader of the opposition the late Mr. Henry Winsor passed away before the money was sent out.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—He was there.

HON. MIN. PUBLIC WORKS:—That money was not sent out while Mr. Winsor was there.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Pardon me sir, he was there.

THE HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—I am sure that the money was not sent out.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Well, the authority was given before the money was sent out. The bridge was done. I am only asking for a square deal in this matter.

HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—I wish to put the Hon. Member right on this point and might say that I am just as sure the man was passed away as I am here.

SIR MICHA$L CASHIN:—Well the board is still there I take it at Aquaforte, and the money was sent out to a private individual who was locked up here in St. John's in an office during the years of the war.

THE HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS: — If the Hon. Leader of the Opposition would refer to the Local Affairs Act he would find that no board should be in existence.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Oh that is a matter of choice. (Gives notice of question).

THE HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—No, it is a matter of law. The information you ask for I cannot give.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Do you mean to say you are not going to answer my question as to whether

there was anybody sent out to inspect the matter?

THE HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—As far as I understood Captain Bonia was sent out.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Well what about the road monies? Is it the intention of the department to allocate the various amounts to the road boards?

THE HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—There are no road boards in existence as far as the department of public works is concerned.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—I think it is time that ou get these matters into right shape. The money ought to be sent there by now. The Hon. gentleman has the best reputation in the House as an honest and straight forward man. So I do not see why he has started to quibble about this thing.

THE HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—I may say that I do not know whether it is the intention of the public works to appoint road boards.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Then you are not going to take any recommendations from the people of the district. I take it that you do not want any one recommended from this district. I hope you are not being made a tool of.

THE HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—I think it very poor form for the leader of the opposition to say this. He ought to know more about the local affairs act.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Any district which needed the assistance of the local affairs act may call the same into operation for their benefit. This district has given the least trouble of all the districts around the island.

THE HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—I am not prepared to take any recommendations from any one with regard to having those boards kept up contrary to the local affairs act.

THE HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—That bill is not ready and I ask that it be deferred. (Re resolutions for the Lighting of Outports.)

THE HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—Mr. Speaker, the local affairs act calls for two months notice before an election can be held.

MR. HIGGINS gave notice of question.

MR. MOORE:—Mr. Speaker, in connection with the matter that Sir Michael Cashin brought up, it seems to be the intention of the Government to hold up the money of Ferryland until the machinery of the local affairs act is put into operation. Why not have an election next week? I don't believe it has ever been done before. It is a most absurd thing. I say, sir, that if this is done, look out for a row.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Mr. Speaker, I think there is some misunderstanding in the matter of local affairs. The same condition exists in Placentia. There are no elected road boards; but surely the roads are not going to be kept without repair because of this fact?

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Speaker, this matter was thought out by me some time ago, and I asked a question as to what was going to be done, that is, whether the money for the districts was going to be sent out as usual. I received an affirmative reply. I want to assure the Hon. Minister that I mean that the money be sent out in the usual way.

THE HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—Mr. Speaker, if any representative comes into my office and asks for money for a road or a bridge, the matter will be attended to.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Speaker, the larger question, of course, is as to the expenditure of the whole lot of public monies. May I suggest that we amend

the local affairs act so that a week's notice will be sufficient for the election of the road boards. The expenditure of money on roads in October would be a waste. I hope this matter will be attended to without delay.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, the situation with respect to Ferryland district and also the district of Placentia and St. Mary's is that the main line grants for the year 1919-1920 were expended last autumn by the late government and in addition practically all the local road grants for these districts were also expended. The bridge in the district of Ferryland to which reference has been made was an imperative necessity. There was no Ferryland grant available for the construction of the bridge so an order was given for the work to be done, the money to be provided for the next fiscal year. The small balances due on local road account for the districts of Ferryland, Placentia and St. Mary's are now available. The matter of the appointment of election of road boards is being attended to.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—The local affairs act requires 60 days notice to be given before the election of road boards. You might know if you want the road boards elected. Nobody wants to keep money that belongs to the district, but let us have the names of the districts that want to have boards elected. The minister is very strong on this point, of having things done under the local affairs act. But I would suggest that the present boards be given the money that is to be spent this spring.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—Mr. Speaker, last winter when the roads in the East End were blocked with snow I applied to the minister to have them cleared, but the minister didn't have the authority. He had to see Mr. Squires. I understand that the Prime Minister has passed over the work of St. John's East to Mr. Carter, although Mr. Carter was not elected.

HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—Mr. Speaker, I may say that Mr. Parsons is the man with whom I confer on matters pertaining to St. John's East. He is strongly opposed to spending money on shoveling snow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider certain resolutions regarding a contract between the Government and the "Susu Shipping Co., Ltd."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—(Re resolutions regarding a contract between the Government and the Susu Shipping Co., Ltd.) This, I take it is a non-contentious contract. It was made the 29th day of September, 1919, between the Government of that day and the Susu Shipping Company, Ltd., and is brought before this administration on or about the first day of May in minor modification. The contract is in the usual form. The contractor agrees to furnish the steamship Susu to run between St. John's and several ports mentioned in the contract extending from Catalina to Fogo inclusive. The service is to commence on or about the first day of May in each year, sailings to be regularly made thereafter and to continue until the close of navigation; the trips to be performed with all reasonable despatch; the steamer not to be detained unduly in any port. The government may from time to time substitute other intermediate port or ports of call and add other ports on the said route without extra charge, provided the ports can be navigated with safety. The days for the departure of the steamer from St. John's shall be fixed by the Government, which has power also to

detain the steamer for a period of twenty-four hours after the time for sailing. The steamer shall carry all mails and shall carry a regular mail officer in charge, for whom an apartment is provided. The stay of the steamer at each intermediate port of call shall be not less than half an hour and at the terminal port not less than two hours, unless the captain and mail officer on board agree that the period of time may be increased or lessened. The steamer shall during the continuance of the contract be kept in a good, seaworthy condition and properly maintained and equipped at the cost of the contractor, the Government having the right to have the steamer surveyed and inspected, contractor agreeing to immediately make good any defficiency under a penalty of $100 a day. Contractor agrees to provide suitable premises in St. John's for the receiving and discharge of freight and the embarking and disembarking of passengers. An amendment is necessary to section 12 as it is noted that the schedule referred to was intended to cover rates for the conveyance of passengers and goods. As a matter of fact, the schedule contains passenger rates only. This defect will be remedied by a proviso that the rates to be paid for the carriage of goods on the Susu shall not exceed the rates charged for the carriage of similar goods for like distances on the northern coastal boats. The contract is terminated by the loss of the steamer. In the event of damage steamer shall be repaired with despatch, but the contractor shall not be entitled for remuneration for the period during which he is unable to continue the service because of damage or because of the steamer requiring to be repaired. Section 16 provides a penalty of $50,00 for the steamer's failing to call at any regular port of call unless prevented by circumstances over which the contractor has no control. The contract is for a period of seven years from the first day of May, 1919. At the expiry of five years the contractor has the privilege, with the consent and approval of the Governor in Council, of placing a larger steamer on the service. In the event of the contractor claiming a larger subsidy because of a larger boat being substituted and no amicable arrangements being made between the Government and the contractor, the matter will be referred to arbitration as provided for in section 26. The contractor is at liberty to assign, sublet or dispose of the contract or any part thereof without the consent of the Government. In the event of the contractor assigning the contract or if there be any habitual breach, the Government may terminate the contract. The subsidy is the sum of $4,000 a month, and there is a provision that no port charges, light dues or taxes additional to those now in force in the Colony shall be imposed on the said steamer during the course of the contract. The contractor is prevented from giving preference to the contractor's freight to the exclusion of the freight of other shippers. Clause 26 provides that in all matters of difference arising between the parties on any matter in connection with the contract, the dispute shall be referred to three judges of the supreme court, who shall hear and determine the dispute as arbitrators under the arbitration clauses of the judicature act, 1904. The contractor is under a penalty to the government of $2,000 for the faithful performance of the contract.

Before proceeding further with the consideration of the contract it might be desirable that the schedule of rates be printed and placed in the hands of the members. I consequent-

ly move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again on to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The chairman of the committee reported that htey had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

MR. BENNETT gives notice of question, re labour bureau.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —I shall answer that now. The government is having an act prepared along these lines and will submit it to the legislature in due course. It will be handed down in the course of a week or two.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN: — With our permission, sir, I would like the honourable the minister of public works to take this matter up and send out the necessary notices under the Local Affairs Act to the District Board to have the election. If the required amount of money asked for by the department has been voted by the Legislature, why not put the proper machinery into operation to have the money utilised. Why not notify the several boards in the district and call for an election. Why not instruct the department to do it.

Mr. Higgins gave notice of question.

Mr. Speaker appointed the following as Library Committee: Hon. the Speaker, Hon. Dr. Barnes, Hon. Mr. Foote, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Scammell.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled An Act to Check Profiteering.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until three of the clock in the afternoon on Monday next, 17th inst.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, May 17th, 1920.

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

MR. SULLIVAN:—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition which was handed me by the Secretary of the Moderate Prohibition Committee. This petition came from the people of St. Bride's, Placentia Bay, and it is one that I fully endorse. Ninety-three residents of that place signed it, and it has for its object a very good cause, namely, the modification of the present evils of prohibition; furthermore, it is to try and do away with the flagrant use of scripts in the first place; secondly to abolish the manufacture of moonshine and other by-products; thirdly, to stop smuggling and fourthly to put an end to the consumption of deletrious substances, such as drugs, essences, Tanlac and other concoctions. In giving this matter my support I want to state as previously stated by me in this House, that it is time that something was done by the Government with a view to the modification of the present prohibition law. I understand that this is not going to be a party measure and that members on both sides of the House are receiving petitions, numerously signed by the people of this country asking for a modification of the prohibition act. I have very much pleasure in supporting the petition.

I have also a petition, Mr. Speaker, signed by practically every voter in Bar Haven, Placentia Bay, on the same matter as the petition I have just presented; also another from Merasheen, Placentia Bay, signed by virtually every voter in the place. It shows that the people are very honest in this matter and have made up

their minds that a very strong effort is going to be made to remedy the evils which we see accruing from this prohibition law. I am quite sure that every Hon. Member in this House is prepared to see that the ent prohibition law tends to destroy tle of whiskey or rum or gin or brandy. And if we cannot give them a bottle a day, let us give them a bottle a week. It would be much better for them to have good stuff than to have them drinking the awful concoctions that have been repeatedly referred to in this House. The present prohibition lad tends to destroy the coming generation and is doing much more harm than good. We do not want to go back to open-bar days again, but we do want to give the people, who have not got the pull or money, a chance of getting something decent to drink when they want it. I think that if any member in this House wants a bottle of rum, whiskey or gun, or any other kind of spirits that he can probably get it because of the pull that he has and the friends that he has. Now I do not see why the people who are not endowed with this pull should not get the same privileges.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, I realise that I am out of order to ask a question at this juncture. Do I understand that the Hon. Member for Placentia, from his place in this House, means to say that the members of the medical fraternity are flagrantly violating the prohibition law?

MR. SULLIVAN:—Certainly not.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petitions presented by my colleague and I offer my support because I have been in contact with people whom I know have labored under great disadvantages in endeavoring to procure liquors for bona fide medical purposes. Whilst the present law, as applied to the city of St. John's and the larger out ports, may be suitable, it is not at all suitable for the isolated parts of the whole country, take for instance a place where a doctor is living a distance of twenty-five or thirty miles away. And if as some of our noted scientists in the medical profession told us is correct, spirituous liquors are beneficial for some diseases, it would be all very well for doctors to prescribe for liquors if people could get the scripts filled, but under present conditions it is absolutely impossible for a large number of our people to get in touch with doctors to get prescriptions. I know of cases where people came to me personally from different parts of the district and requested that I intercede for them and get them a small portion of brandy. With the result that after going myself to doctors and offering to put up the money myself I was absolutely refused. I say that I welcome any moderation of this prohibition law or anything that will eliminate the present state of affairs, and I do not think it is just that people of St. John's can get a bottle of liquor whenever they want one whereas the majority of the people scattered all over the island, East, West, South and North are in the unenviable position that they cannot get in touch with medical men. And if the outport people do happen to get a script they are so far aloof from the controller's office that a month elapses from the time they get the script until the liquor is forwarded to them. I am absolutely opposed to the return of the open bar-rooms, and I believe that prohibition has done a great deal of good, but I do not think it was the desire or the object or the intention of the majority of our people when they supported this measure a few years ago, to have conditions such as exist to-day,

arise. I welcome any honest attempt made to satisfy the whole people, and I have very much pleasure in giving my hearty support to the petition presented by my colleague.

HON. MINISTER OF SHIPPING:—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Grate's Cove objecting to the movement that is on foot to do anything in the way of modification with regard to the prohibtiion law. The protest very strongly against any measure being introduced in this house to modify the present act now on the statute book, which, as you know, sir, the country has spoken on and declared itself in favor of with a very decent majority. When that act was about to be formed it was fought in the very hardest way possible, yet the majority of the people voted against the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors. As I have said, sir, the people of Grate's Cove protest vigorously against any legislation being enacted in this House that is going to modify the present prohibition law.

MR. WINSOR:—I beg leave to present a number of petitions from the residents of Wesleyville, Hopeville and Valleyfield and they deal with the same subject as that mentioned in the petitions presented by the Hon. Member from Bay de Verde, that is, there be no modification of the Prohibition Act. They are practically signed by all the voters of the district. I support the prayer of the petition, sir, and I think the act has not been properly enforced. The petitioners also ask that the act be more strenuously enforced and that there be no modification of the act. I ask that they be handed to the department to which they relate.

MR. ABBOTT:—I have much pleasure in supporting the petitions presented by my colleague dealing with the Prohibition Act.

MR. SCAMMELL:—I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Ship Cove in the district of St. Barbe. They ask for a sum of money to be allocated for the construction of a public wharf in that settlement. I might say that there were two or three important settlements in this district. Cook's Hr. and Ship Cove are very important centres judging from the commerce accorded these places. I know that two or three hundred vessels loaded fish at these places last summer. There were vessels from everywhere north. This goes to show how important these settlements are. I support the petition and hope it will receive from the Government the consideration it deserves. I ask that it be handed to the department to which it appertains. While I am on my feet I will also avail of the opportunity of presenting a petition from the residents of Seal Cove, White Bay. It is on the same subject, a public wharf, and they ask that a sum of money be allocated for its construction. Now Seal Cove is not a safe harbour for a public wharf. I think South Arm would be a very suitable place for it. Even if the wharf was constructed at Seal Cove it would be impossible for ships to work there. I think if the wharf were constructed at South Arm it would suit the requirements all round. It is a safe and commodious harbour. I have much pleasure in giving these petitions my unqualified support.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Bennett gave notice of question.

Hon. Minister of Finance gave notice thet he would on to-morrow ask leave to move the House into a committee of the whole to consider certain resolutions for the amendment of the Income Tax, 1918.

Hon. Minister of Finance gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to move the House into a committee of the whole to consider certain resolutions for the amendment of the Business Profit Tax Act, 1917.

Hon. Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce the bill entitled "An Act to amend the chapter 86 of the consolidated statutes of Newfoundland (3rd series) entitled 'of stipendiary magistrate and justice of the peace.'"

Hon. Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled "An act to amend cap. 27 of the consolidated statutes of Newfoundland (third series) entitled "On Death duties."

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the bill entitled "An act concerning the registration of midwives."

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce the bill entitled "An act to amend chapter 157 of the consolidated statutes of Newfoundland (third series) entitled 'Of the fire patrol.'"

Hon. Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce the bill entitled "An act to amend Chapter 139 of the consolidated statutes of Newfoundland (third series) entitled 'Of the encouragement of agriculture.'"

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider certain resolutions to provide for the lighting of streets in the outports.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of committee.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I move that the House arise and sit as committee of the whole on this measure. (Resolutions re the lighting of the streets of the outports), I would like to say that it is very short and provides that if any settlement desires to impose a tax on all coal imported therein in respect of the lighting of streets, the Governor in Council is given power to impose a tax by proclamation on the receipt of a petition of the residents. The resolutions speak for themselves and therefore I move that the first resolution be adopted.

HON. THE SPEAKER:—I would like to ask the Honorable Minister what is to become of the settlements who have lighting at the present time?

THE HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE —I understand that these towns are paying for their lighting out of their road grants at the present time. Carbonear has a tax on coal which goes towards the payment for the water service there and I think it cannot avail itself of this act. This only refers to those settlements who petition the Governor in Council to carry this into effect and who have not water service. Those towns which have the water service have incorporated in the acts dealing with latter a tax on the coal exported and this goes against their water supply. This bill is being drafted according to representations made to the government by those towns which desire to connect with the electric light and is being completed so that any settlement may take advantage of them. If the electric light is extended along certain places and others require it, then they can make a petition to the Governor in Council to impose a tax on the coal imported. But at present we do not know what settlements these are.

MR. HIGGINS:—I wish to point out that while no one disagrees with the principle of the resolution yet I

take on what the Minister of Justice has stated, that they are really the outcome of requests from particular places but I am sure these places are so situated that the electric light is easily available and can obtain light without calling upon their road grants. Why not have a measure where the whole thing is included? I make the suggestion that while the water service is more important than the lighting, the Governor in Council be given the power to impose a tax whether the people of a particular place require the installation of water service or the extension of the electric light. Apparently these resolutions are from particular places and I think they ought to be more general.

THE HON. THE PRIME MINISTER —In reference to the remarks of hon. member for St. John's East, I may say that the electric light incurs not so great an expenditure as that of the water service. A water company has to make an enormous capital expenditure such as was made by the Carbonear Water Company. This practically is obviated with regard to the electric light. It would be quite impracticable under a general act to impose a tax with reference to an undertaking for a large expenditure for the installation of the water service. This act only contemplates those sections of the country such as Conception Bay, the outer sections of St. John's, Carbonear and Port Union and such other parts that will petition. This bill is expressly intended to deal with the lighting of the outport towns and the lighting only. It would be impracticable to include within the scope of the bill the matter of water supply and sewerage. The taxes on coal to any outport may reasonably amount to a sufficient sum to provide the annual expense of the lighting of the streets. By that I do not mean the expense incidental to the development of electric power, but the annual expense necessary for the payment for electricity consumed. In its immediate operation the bill will probably affect only those places where electric plants are in existence; for instance, in the Peninsula of Avalon, and in the Bonavista-Trinity Bay section by the electric power plant at Port Union. As power plants are provided in other sections of the country, the act will be capable of operation. It is not thought that the revenue which can be derived from this act will be sufficient in the majority of cases at least to provide for the additional expenditure incidental to the erection of an electric lighting plant and the providing of poles and wires for street lighting purposes, but it will be sufficient to provide for the annual cost of current consumed. At the present time many sections of the country are paying out of their road grants the annual cost of street lighting. Under this bill the towns have an opportunity of paying for their street lighting out of a coal tax and so relieving their road grants of the burden of street lighting expenses. In some places it might be possible for the residents of the towns to organize a cheap lighting system themselves. provide the necessary capital outlay. the tax being sufficient to provide operating expense and interest on capital invested. In the case of water and sewerage systems the usual expense is so great that it would be quite impossible to conceive of any road board undertaking the matter of supplying water and sewerage, and consequently each town desiring to enter into such an undertaking should apply specially to the legislature for legislative authority in the same way as Carbonear, Harbor Grace, and Placentia have already done. This act applies to the whole island, but in the

immediate present only those sections of the island which have electric plants in operation will be in a position to avail of it. Ultimately the idea of street lighting may develop so that the larger towns and settlements all round the coast may organise electric power plants of their own for street and household lighting purposes and will by this bill have power to put a tax on coal for the purpose of paying for street lighting to encourage them in such public-spirited development. I do not agree with the honorable member for St. John's East that the scope of the bill should be enlarged so as to include provision for water and sewerage supply, as such a matter necessitates a very large capital outlay which cannot possibly be handled on the basis of a coal tax.

MR. HIGGINS:—The company's power is put to the disposal of the people. Bell Island at the present time pays for street lighting out of road and marine grants. They are faced over there with the problem of water supply, and it is a serious problem. Bell Island is a very important settlement, and if provision is not made in this act to get a water supply I hope it will be done later.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—This bill is intended to cover the whole colony. Bonavista, Twillingate,)xploits, and any other places that want electric lighting. There are lots of towns where water supply is available, and if water power is not available, it can be supplied by motor power. The proper thing to do with respect to the water system is to provide for it by means of another act. Bonavista has been looking for a water system for a number of years. If the people in any settlement want a water supply it should be provided for by putting a tax on some article of importation.

HON THE SPEAKER:—Why I read this matter is because we have in Carbonear a lighting system and a water system, and we have a coal tax and a property tax. We want to put the water service in decent condition. If you take the fifty cents a ton tax that is charged on coal and apply only to the supply of coal what is going to happen to the water system?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—This cannot be done. This act refers only to those towns and settlements where lighting is available and the inhabitants petition the Governor in Council to impose a tax on coal for the purpose of lighting their settlement.

HON. SPEAKER:—The Chairman of Committees reports these resolutions passed without amendment.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the said resolutions without amendment and recommend 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 for the lighting of streets in the outports' was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of the Hon. the Prime Minister the bill entitled 'An act to check profiteering was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Mr. MacDonnell asked the Hon. the Premier, whether it is the intention of the government to vote sufficient money to put the railroad in proper repair, either to the Reid Nfld. Co., or to any other party or parties.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—This whole matter is in the hands of a committee of council.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked the Minister

of Finance and Customs for a statement in detail of the expenditure of loan of $6,000,000 raised in 1919.

The Hon. Minister of Finance tabled the information asked for.

Sir J. C. Crosbie asked the Minister of Finance why the cheques due April 1st for old age pensions have not yet been sent out.

The Hon. Minister of Finance tabled the information asked for.

Mr. Higgins asked the Hon. the Prime Minister if the Government has decided upon any policy with regard to the holding of elections for local councils at Bell Island, if so what is the nature of the same?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—A petition has been signed by the people of Bell Island asking that a bill be introduced for incorporation. In the meantime the present local boards have been asked to continue their work.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—I desire to inform the Hon. Member for St. George's, Mr. MacDonnell, that on tomorrow, I will be in a position to table correspondence which he asked for, in relation to the highway on the West Coast.

MR. MacDONNELL:—In reference to section 16, I think this is one of the clauses that is always found in a contract and it is one that helps very much to do away with the contract. Supposing a captain sees that by making a certain port out of the way he would avoid the possibility of being caught in a rising storm, do you think it is fair that this captain should be penalised. I think this should be left to the discretion of the captain and this section is unfair and should be modified.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I might say for the information of the Hon. Member for St. George's, that this is the only pressure the Government has to compel a captain to do his very best in making a port. My hon. friend should see that it is necessary to have some such power over the captain, otherwise he would be skipping ports.

MR. MacDONNELL:—If a man purposely misses a port I think some arrangement could be made with the owners to have him discharged from the service, but I think it is very unfair to have an iron bound penalty provided for such a breach.

MR. SAMPSON:—I have known of many cases where captains missed ports when they could have easily called at them.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, the department of posts and telegraphs and also the department of education, necessitate a form of amendment, in the chapter relating to the legislative disabilities law, which is chapter 4, consolidated statutes, third series and the subsection relating to seats being vacated is applicable to the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, and to the Acting Minister of Education. It will be remembered that the Minister of Posts and telegraphs, and the acting Minister of Education went to their constituencies in December last, and were elected to their various positions by the unanimous will of the voters. The idea of section 2 is to make it unnecessary for them to go again to their constituencies. Section 3 deals with the Department of Shipping. As was indicated in the manifesto, and also in the speech from the throne, it is the intention of the Government to wind up the Department of Shipping, and were it not for serious conditions which arose last winter, the department would have been wound up. Mr. W. H. Cave has resigned his position as Acting Minister of Shipping, because of the provisions which makes it unlawful for him to hold his position any longer than six months,

without going out again to his district, and as Mr. Hickman has asked for a recount of the ballots of Bay de Verde and as there has been no decision as yet in that case, under section 3 it shall be lawful for him to hold his position as Minister of Shipping until December 31st, 1920, so that it will be unnecessary to make another appointment. It would be absurd for him to go again to his district, firstly because the Government intends to wind up the Department of Shipping and secondly because it is not certain whether the seat belongs to him, or to Mr. Hickman. I now move that this bill be read the second time.

The House adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, May 18, 1920.

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

MR. ABBOTT:—I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Charlottetown asking that the sum of three hundred dollars be granted to cut down a bank in that place a work which is an absolute necessity. The petition is signed by James Simmons, Samuel Abbott and about fifty others. I also ask leave to present a petition from Amherst Cove. The petitioners ask that the Government grant the sum of eight hundred dollars for the construction of a new road through the locality. I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of these petitions and ask that it be referred to the department of public works and hope that the Government will give them their consideration they desire.

HON. MR. FOOTE:—I ask leave to present a petition from the people of Grand Bank. The petition is practically signed by all the people of that town. The prayer of the petition is a strong protest against any modification of the prohibition act. It furasks that there be a more stringent enforcement of the law. I will deal with this matter later.

MR. MacDONNELL:—I ask leave to present a petition from a number of voters from Bay of Islands which was forwarded to me by Rev. ——— and it is signed by forty men asking that there be no change made in the prohibition act except that there be a more stringent enforcement. Like Mr. Foote, I will further deal with this matter at a later stage.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Since coming into the House I have received the following communication from Mr. John J. St. John, Secretary of the Moderate Prohibition Committee, (reads letter), in accordance with the request of a number of my constituents. I have much pleasure in presenting the following petitions, Nos. ', 30, 34, 57, 61 and 117 on the subject of the matter in said letter, (Modification of the Prohibition Act.

MR. SMALL:—I beg leave to present a petition of thirty two people of the district of Burgeo. The prayer of the petition is that there be no modification of the Prohibition Act. I have great pleasure in presenting this petition and ask that it be referred to the proper authorities.

MR. TARGETT:—I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Trinity of Trinity district. It is on the same subject as that mentioned in the preceding petitions, no modification of the Prohibition Act. Probably later I will be able to say something on this when it comes before the House for discussion. I ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates. I wish also to present a petition from the residents of Hant's Hr. asking that a sum of money be granted to repair the road which has not been repaired for five

years. This road leads to a number of places including some fishing rooms and I ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates and I trust that it shall receive the serious consideration of the Government.

MR. HIGGINS:—In order that the east end of St. John's shall not be outdone by the West in the desire to help towards the betterment of things socially, I desire to present a number of petitions forwarded to me likewise to those presented by the leader of the Government in respect to the matter of moderating the Prohibition Law. These petitions are numbered and come from the eastern section of St. John's; 104, 109 Bell Island, section of Torbay 33; portion of the town 72. These are a few of the many more to come from St. John's East. I present the petition in the light adopted by those who preceded me except perhaps I state before presenting them that I am in support of the prayer of the petitions.

DR. JONES:—I beg leave to present a petition from a number of people residing at Indian Pond, Seal Cove, Brigus Junction and Chapel's Cove in the district of Hr. Main, and they ask that some modification be made to the prohibition act; also a petition from Rev. Father Sheehan and about fifty others asking that a sum of one hundred dollars be immediately spent on a road from Hr. Main to certain cultivated ground. This road has been bad for some time and they ask that one hundred dollars be expended annually on this road. It is essential that it be put into good condition as it is required to work the land. It is about two miles long and it is impossible to keep it up out of the ordinary road grant. I ask that it be referred to the Department to which it relates and hope that the prayer of the petition will be granted if possible.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I beg to lay upon the table of the House the report of the public schools of Newfoundland under the Salvation Army boards for year ending December 31st, 1919.

CAPT. JONES:—I beg to present a petition from the residents of Northwest Arm in the district of Twillingate asking that that place be made a port of call for the S. S. Prospero. This is an industrious settlement. It has four or five small and large mills. A good quantity of supplies go there from time to time. I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition and ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled report of schools under Salvation Army branch, 1919.

Sir John Crosbie gave notice of question.

Mr. Walsh gave notice of question.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of the Hon. the Minister of Justice, the bill, entitled, "An Act to amend chapter 86 of the consolidated statutes of Newfoundland (third series) entitled 'of stipendiary magistrates and justice of peace"' was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the bill entitled "An Act to amend Cap. 27 of the consolidated statutes of Newfoundland (third series) entitled 'of death duties,' was introduced to read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act Governing the registry of midwives" was introduced and read a first time

and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 157 of the consolidated statutes of Newfoundland (third series' entitled 'of the fire patrol'" was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "an act to amend the consolidated statutes of Newfoundland (third series) entitled 'of the encouragement of agriculture"' was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary what response, if any were made to the public notices appearing in the newspaper in Dec. last asking for tenders for four coastal steamers and what is the present status of this matter.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:— (Answer to Mr. MacDonnell) The whole matter of inland transportation is receiving the consideration of a committee of council.

In reply to Mr. Higgin's question I would state a petition has recently been received from certain residents of Bell Island seeking an act of incorporation for the island. The matter is under the consideration of the Government. In the meantime the two councils have been asked to continue their work.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked the Hon. Prime Minister to lay on the table of the House copies of the correspondence between himself and His Excellency the Governor in reference to the appointment of the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs and the Minister of Education and also any other documents in his office pertaining to the same matter.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:— The only documents appertaining to the matter were the commissions of the ministers. The correspondence consists of the usual formal letters to the ministers notifying them of their appointments. There has been no other official correspondence.

SIR M. P. CASHIN—Will you table the letters?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER — I am tabling them now.

Mr. Bennett asked the Minister of Public Works, if the third clerk in his department Mr. Jas. Murphy has been pensioned and what is the amount of such pension. Also if Mr. Manning the stenographer has been appointed to the vacant position over the head of Mr. Netten the assistant road accountant who has been some years in the department and if so why has this been done.

Hon. Minister of Public Works tabled the reply.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked the Minister of Public Works to furnish a statement showing in detail the expenditure of $408,000.78 allocated to his department from the Loan of 1919.

HON. MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS: In reply to the question of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition I would like to say that I hope to have that information to-morrow.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked the Minister of Public Works on whose recommendation did he allocate $1,200.00 to Ferryland out of the so-called "wash-out grant"; giving the particulars of the work to be done, and to whom the money was allocated. If it was allocated to Capt. Bonia and if it is now in his possession?

HON. MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS —In reply I would say that Captain

Bonia is out of town. I will table the information on his return.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider the bill entitled "an act to amend chapter 4 of the consolidated statutes of Newfoundland (third series) entitled 'of the legislative disabilities and the vacation of seats in the House of Assembly."'

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of committee.

MR. HIGGINS: — Mr Chairman, when the bill came before us for its second reading, and when for the first time we were made aware of its content and of its objects those of us on this side felt that when the bill came before the House in the Committee stage, in justice to this House and ourselves, a word or two should be said, so that there would be no misunderstanding, not alone in the House, but in the country at large as to what views we at least held, concerning it The bill purports to be a simple one and on the face of it, it does not seem to represent anything of much moment. Shortly the object of the bill is to confirm the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs and the Minister of Education in their respective offices without the necessity of their having to go back to their districts for re-election, and personally. I do not see very much that is objectionable in the provision regarding these two seats. But I do think that something has been introduced into this bill for which, on proper consideration, it will be admitted that there is no necessity, and something which it seems to me would be a mistake for us to enact. That is the section which permits the Minister of Shipping to hold office till the end of the present year. The whole history of this matter is interesting and my remarks are more or less made with a view to directing attention to this fact and to emphasize the necessity of our thinking beyond the mere caprice of the moment or beyond what was referred to in the past by the Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs as "political expediency." I appreciate, of course, the position the Government found itself in with regard to these matters, but the humour of the situation cannot be mistaken; it is so humorous in fact that it must go down to posterity. Two Ministers of the Crown, and "all honourable men" to use a historical phrase, very estimable men, appointed to positions which did not exist. Two positions were created that were never foreshadowed, I mean that they were never foreshadowed to the country at large nor to anybody outside that privileged few of the inner circle of that great organization which wields such an influence to-day over the political life of this country. Nothing was known of the creation of these departments until it was announced in the Advocate, it was news to those outside the circle, but after all we had to be satisfied with that, because it was the desire of that great organization that these offices be created. and indeed if it was the desire of that organization to reform the cabinet nothing could be said against it. Mr. Halfyard and Dr. Barnes went to the country and were elected to positions that had no existence legally, but in spite of this, we find by reference to the correspondence tabled that these gentlemen had been appointed away back in December last and yet it is only since we came here that Mr. Halfyard and Dr. Barnes have begun to be created respectively Minister of Posts and Telegraphs and Minister of Education, and the job is not yet completed, for we have not even yet seen the bill respecting the

Department of Education. And indeed until both bills have passed the two branches of the legislature and been assented to by His Excellency the departments do not exist. And so the first and second acts of the comedy have been played, and now we come to the third act, and we on this side of the House, like our friends on the other side play our part as actors in the comedy and we say that it would be a pity if we spoiled the humour of this thing by not playing this third act out to a finish.

To that, however, I take no exception for there would be little or no point in doing so where these gentlemen are concerned. If their positions did not exist legally, they were created by that power which is greater than any government, and when the Minister of Marine and Fisheries issued his fiat the thing was done before it was done, and because we are living in the shadow of that great man and because we know what he may see fit to do, we dare not offer any resistance to his will. We on this side of the House are afraid that if we are not careful, he will make some of us ministers, for we know what the mighty man do. He was able to anticipate the feelings of the people to such an extent, he knew so well that they wanted a minister of education and he was so confident that the men he picked were the very ones whom the people wanted to fill these positions that he had no hesitation whatever in chosing them. The public must bow to the ukase of the Mighty One because his great prophetic knowledge renders it impossible for him to go wrong, but I do say that he should not flood us with ministers and so create a situation where there will be so many positions of emolument that it will come to be looked upon as an honor and a decided privilege to be an ordinary private member. But the most humorous part of the whole thing is that which applies to the Minister of Shipping. Section 3 of the bill reads: (Here Mr. Higgins reads the section).

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—That section has been amended. Your objection has been anticipated. The amendment makes it read as follows: (The Prime Minister reads the proposed amendment).

MR. HIGGINS:—I'm afraid the Hon. Prime Minister has too many worries on his hands to see the humour of the situation as I see it. The point I make is that Mr. Cave will hold his seat, according to the bill, until the end of December "unless the seat is declared vacant by the judges of the Supreme Court." That is the most delightful part of it and it is a great pity we weren't told that even if the Supreme Court did declare the seat vacant the Minister of Shipping would still hold his seat.

It is the one incomplete thing in that bill.

HON. PRIME MINISTER: — Will you move an amendment?

MR. HIGGINS:—I think this is a high class thing to be served up to us, and I think it is a joke to come down here and consider a bill which states that a minister shall hold office but shall not hold office if the judges say that he must get out. Should Section 3 be put in? It has been admitted by everybody that the department of shipping is through, and if anything is to be done it should be done now. None of us could speak but in a kindly way of the Hon. Mr. Cave, but I think it is an insult to him to ask him to stay in office. He is too good a man for that. I am sure that he would not have this House violate its laws by keeping him in any office that is going to be wound up at the end of the year. To keep him in office under such cir-

cumstances will appear to the country at large more or less as a convenient way of carrying along a supporter of the government.

It is decidedly obnoxious to put such a measure on the statute book. Mr. Cave has handed in his resignation of that position, which is absolute evidence of his intentions. In handing in his resignation he has complied with the law of the land, and having done that, why does the Government come in and ask us to pass that section. It is improper legislation anyway. If it was absolutely imperative for any man to hold office for a certain time it might possibly be just, but to come in here and say Mr. Cave should hold office to December 1920 you might just as well pass legislation to keep him in office until 1924. Four years or six months would make no difference. So far as the measure is concerned, on its face it states in effect that the department should be abolished and that it was going to be wound up this year. Surely there are men enough on the other side of the House to do the winding up of this department. I am sure we are free to say that what has to be done is purely work of an administrative character, and Mr. Hall and his staff could easily do this. There's no occasion at all for this section and the enacting and setting up of this section is absolutely unnecessary; beside it is flatly contrary to all traditional constitutional practice in the old country itself, and I do ask the Government to eliminate it. The section as it reads gives no guarantee that the department will be wound up even this year. There is nothing binding on the Government to wind it up, and if it is the intention of the Government under guise of this measure to carry along this gentleman for a time with the object of floating someone else in there later, I think it would be grossly dishonest.

The words of the bill on this point I wish to have made clear. It states that the department should be discontinued after this year. It gives no guarantee that it will be discontinued after this year. It gives no guarantee that it will be discontinued, and I ask the hon. members of the government to consider that "political expediency," as my friend the hon. minister of posts and telegraphs has chosen to call it, is not always profitable, and take care that some of these measures like Mother Carey's chickens don't "come home to roost."

There is no such thing as a precedent for legislation which recites that a department is about to be abolished, and yet proceeds to "whitewash" a man who illegally remains there. If the hon. minister of shipping were in his seat to-day and were still known as the minister of shipping, he could not remain in the House. We should ask ourselves in justice to him and the district which he represents if this position should be set up? I think that not alone would it be a mistake, but it would surely place discredit on all of us if allowed to go broadcast throughout the land. I don't think there is any occasion for it. Why surely there are enough members on the other side of the House to fill this position. Why not let the great man who undertakes to look after so many departments take this department under his wing? Where only a couple of months remain for the existence of the department we should not have to come down here and pass a special law for that purpose. I have no doubt that the hon. member for Bay de Verde, Mr. LeGrow, could go down and run that job for three or four months.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, I wish to take exception to one statement made by the

hon. member for St. John's East, Mr. Higgins. He said that this bill was introduced with a view to carrying along a government supporter. Mr. Cave, I would like to inform him, is absolutely independent. He did not seek this position, and he can support himself without any assistance from anybody.

MR. MacDONNELL:—Mr. Chairman, as has already been pointed out, this bill which is now before the House is a shining example of corrupt legislature. If I remember rightly it was the Hon. Prime Minister himself, in the Upper House, who one more than one occasion, took exception to the government for allowing a certain number of seats to be filled by defeated candidates, for allowing this House of Assembly to be a rump parliament. Well, a rump parliament is bad enough, but we are going further, we are going to make it hereditary.

It used to be delightful to have it pointed out to us that there was one man in St. John's West, Lord Morris, who was looking after his constituency in the House of Lords in England, and his seat was not filled. There was another man who was a judge of the court, in this town, and his seat was not filled; another man who was at the head of the controller's department, and his seat was not filled. We had in all ten men, and no move was being made to put men in their places, and not one condemned it more than the Prime Minister. I said then that their conduct was reprehensible, and I still say it, and we are asked to go a step further. We are asked to change the law or rather to break the law of the land, in order that a man who has no right to a position anyway, may have it.

With regard to the contents of the bill it is quite in keeping with the way in which the department was sprung upon this country. Mr. Higgins has pointed about these departments, until one morning he saw an account of them in The Advocate, and although I was a member of that party, I was in the same position with regard to the department of posts and telegraphs, and education, and this bill being sprung upon the House in this manner is in keeping with that secrecy which surrounded those departments. I have no doubt that it would be a nice point of law, as to whether the actions of those two gentlemen up to the time this bill was brought into this House were legal.

Some time ago I asked what work was being done by the Minister of Education, and I was told I would get the information when the bill came before the House. I have no doubt that the Minister of Education is keeping within the law in doing nothing, because anything that he might do would be illegal. This bill, sir, is the logical conclusion that comes of the action started a few days ago. We then passed a legislation which gave to men who had no claim to them certain sums of money. We have had men elected to positions which do not exist, and I presume they were paid salaries for these positions, salaries which I do not think they were entitled to. Take the Minister of Shipping. We will see that he holds his position till the end of the year and then put it off further if necessary, in other words that this act is not necessary. That is what we are asked to decide. As is not necessary to point there are numbers of men on the government side who could fill this position, and if it is the fear that the appointment of any member would create jealousy then there are other ways out. This question of bills is becoming a complicated one, and the best thing we can do is get a formula.

Take the Prime Minister, who is Prime Minister, Colonial Secretary, and Minister of Militia, although he gets no salary for that position, and I am sure he would have no objection to taking another position. That would be one way out. I am sure no one would be offended if he took charge of that department. If that does not suit, what about Mr. Gibbs? Why not make him Minister of Shipping? I am sure everyone on the Government side would be delighted with the appointment. As Mr. Higgins said, one never knows when one is going to be made a minister. A certain anxiety has been expressed over one of the candidates for Hr. Main. Why not make Mr. Woodford minister of shipping, and give him a job as was promised him? It would not be more absurd than asking us to sanction this bill. This thing, if it were not tragic, would be delightfully funny. There was a time when three men out of all the members of the House of Assembly, held an office. Of late years the hard thing to know is which of the members of the government is not holding an office, and defeated candidates of the party are holding offices with emoluments, and being made ministers.

As Mr. Higgins has pointed out, that state of affairs is like Mr. W. S Gilbert's composition. The king of the country which he was considering wanted everyone to be in the same position as himself, and he tried to remodel everything. Everyone in the army was a general, and everyone in the navy was an admiral. Dukes and kings were common things, and earls were three a penny. The situation here threatens to become similar. We will have all the members of the government ministers, defeated candidates will be ministers, with a seat in the Upper House, and somebody like our friend, Mr. Woodford, will be made a minister without a seat in either House. At that time everybody was a prime ministers, and party leaders were met by twos and threes in the streets. That is what we are coming to. We are disregarding what we were sent here to do. A man shall go back to his constituency for re-election after six months, not at all we will have departments which have been conceived over night and born in the morning. This condition of things is only fit for comic opera, and I hope it will be produced in some of the theatres.

It is a pity that more of the citizens of St. John's are not here to-day to enjoy this comedy. I say, sir, that there is no limit to the absurdities that such legislation will lead to if allowed to continue.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—Mr. Chairman, before this bill passes I would like to say a few words anent it. Like my legal friend, the Hon. Mr. Higgins, I am somewhat astounded at the bill, as I was under the impression when in conversation with some members of the government that it was only covering the positions of minister of posts and telegraphs and minister of education, but I am certainly astounded to see now that it covers my hon. friend, the acting minister of shipping, Mr. Cave, although he has resigned.

I think the bill in itself, as far as the ministers of posts and telegraphs and education are concerned is perfectly right, because, I presume there was nothing else to be done, seeing that they have already been appointed to fill these positoins; but why the hon. the prime minister and the government have decided to come in here with an act, which is irregular, and appoint Mr. Cave head of a department which you are going to do away with in six months time, I am at a loss to know.

I remember a couple of years ago when I was appointed minister of shipping, bills were passed to cover positions of ministers of the crown, but the great argument at that time was that a national government existed and the great war was on. To-day matters are entirely different. But even when those bills were being put through a couple of years ago, the present prime minister, in his place in the Upper House, was very strongly opposed to them, and in fact did not believe in them at all, but I suppose it is a case of Peck's bad boy, "What we do is alright, but what the other fellows do is all wrong."

I would like to say that in my opinion that the department of shipping, under the control of the hon. minister of marine and fisheries, is just as essential to-day as it was two years before the war, because until the hon. minister of marine is prepared to take that position and get extra help to run it, and run it as it should be run, we have a grave crisis ahead of us. My argument for that statement is as simple as A. B. C.

The position in this country today is worse than it was any time before and the hon. minister of marine and fisheries knows what I am saying to be correct. We are in a very serious position and a more serious position than I would like to tell this country, but I honestly believe that we are standing on the verge of a volcanic eruption and do not know when it will come off. The hon. minister of marine and fisheries knows this as well as I do and if the hon. the prime minister and his government don't know, the Hon. Mr. Coaker ought to tell him quick. I repeat, without any hesitation whatever, that you are in an acute position to-day, and I appeal to the Hon. Mr. Coaker to say whether I am right or whether I am wrong.

You have in this country now something like from twelve to fifteen thousand hogsheads of salt and you cannot get a tubfull out of Cadiz or some ports of Spain. You have only enough salt in this town to-day to last seven days for the supplying of all the vessels that come from north. I make that statement without fear of contradiction. In the light of that then do you mean to tell me that you do not want a minister of shipping? When I was minister of shipping in 1918 I was associated with the hon. minister of marine and fisheries, he was on my board and he knows how I had to fight to bring salt here.

In 1919 we had in this city over thirty thousand tons or approximately one hundred and twenty thousand hogsheads of salt To-day you stand to meet a situation of less than a hundred hogsheads and still you want to clew up that department. Let me emphasize that it is more essential than ever it was; and let me tell you further that the minister of shipping should be a member of the executive government, and if the Hon. Mr. Cave had held an executive seat you would not be in the position you are in to-day. I say if he had held an executive seat he would have been able to confer with his executive government to lay correspondence time and again before his brother councillors. I do not blame the Hon. Mr. Cave for the coal situation that exists in the city at present, because I know that he told the executive about it. But what help could he get from them? He simply had to fight his own battles and the only way he could do that properly was to occupy a seat in the council himself. I believe that the Hon. Mr. Cave was entitled to an executive seat, and I told him personally that it was imperative that he should have it, in order to carry on that position correctly; and I say to the hon. the prime minister

and to his government that the Hon. Mr. Cave was entitled to an executive seat, and I told him personally that it was imperative that he should have it, in order to carry on that position correctly; and I say to the hon. the prime minister and to his government that the Hon. Mr. Cave has been treated unfairly. And I say, sir if you hope to extend his term of office, let him go to the district of Bay de Verde again for election, if the department of shipping is considered necessary by you, but if you think it is not necessary, clew it up immediately.

Look at the coal situation to-day. I wish to state here right openly in coal question was never more serious than it is at present. Such a condition of affairs would not probably exist if the Hon. Mr. Cave had had the opportunity to do his duty properly, but for the reason already stated, he was hampered and obstructed in the performance of his duties. At present schooners are lying up in Sydney Harbour awaiting to get a ton of coal to bring down. You will find there schooners from all parts of Newfoundland lying there for andefinite period.

I have previously referred to the salt situation, and I fear that the result will, in my judgment, be serious. Something should be done and I appeal to the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. We want to do something and do it quick. We want to help the fishermen and to get them to work to enable us to settle the price of fish for them for next fall.

Here is another serious matter confronting the country to-day. Four weeks ago I asked for information on the same subject, but have heard nothing since. It is really the business of the shipping department. There is not a word from the Prime Minister or anybody else about it. I refer to the coastal service. We want a definite policy outlined concerning this important matter. You members on the Government side do not know any more about it than we do on the Opposition side. The Portia is on dock but we do not know when she will resume the service on the South West Coast. Regarding the Prospero, who knows when she will get north? Not a member on the Government side knows. The time is come when Mr. Cave, if appointed again, should be given the power to enable him to do his duty in a right way, and not have him running around after the Prime Minister whenever he wants to do something. If I had to go looking for the prime minister every time I wanted to do something, during my tenure of office, all would have been lost. I say again it is not fair to Mr. Cave, or it is not straight for the way in which he has been treated. If he has responsibilities and blame to shoulder, well then give him some powers. I would like to know from the Prime Minister what the government are considering or proposing to do with reference to the coastal service. Let us know what they are considering and we will help them out. I am not here to obstruct, I am here to assist if I can, in honor of the constituency that sent me here.

Certainly I think that this is a vicious bill. However, if Mr. Cave, by accident or oversight on the part of the Prime Minister, is considered passed his day after another try-out of six months, get some other man to try the job and endeavour to do something in that department. You cannot expect the Hon. Minister of Marine to do it all. I know pretty well what a heavy task he has got to perform and the obligations he has got to meet. I know and he knows that this very time is more serious than at any time since I was in

charge. I want to appeal to the Prime Minister and his associates to take this salt question up seriously and get to work at it or you may have no codfish next fall to put a price on. Just think of this, Mr. Chairman: This time twelve months ago (in 1919) we had one hundred and twenty thousand hogsheads of salt in St. John's, and to-day you have less than sixteen thousand hogsheads; and that in addition there is now a strike on in Cadiz and we are informed from Cadiz that they cannot give us any definite idea when they can give us any salt, nor can we get a shovelful of salt out of other ports in Spain. Consequently we should ask ourselves this evening: Whither we are going and whither tending.

During my absence here last season when this legislature was open there was quite a deal of talk over the matter and price of salt. I regret I was not here. At that time we had our salt supply arranged, but if I had not held up the combine in December 1918 and demanded that salt be brought to this country, you would have realised what it meant to be without salt, but you are going to be without it this time and that is the funny side of it. Through the assistance of Sir E. R. Bowring, on the other side, and Mr. W. B. Grieve, who agreed with me, we got the salt here last year. Job and his outfit decided not have the salt come here. If you had been without salt last year, on account of Job and Morey, what a lovely position you would have been in.

I hope that this House will not tumble down about somebody's ears before this thing is got through with. I appeal to the Hon. Mr. Coaker, who is the only hon. gentleman on the government side whom I know personally that I can appeal to, to endeavour to save this salt situation and incidentally save his friends, the fishermen of this country. I also appeal to him, while arranging in act here, to appoint Mr. Cave as Minister of Shipping.

The situation is more serious than dreamt of. I question if we will have enough of hard coals to keep us going next winter. If a fellow gets up here and has the foresight to make a prophecy as to the outlook for Newfoundland, he is called a pessimist. But what can he do? You cannot close your eyes to the facts. They are and you have got to realise them, whether you are on the government side of the house or the opposition. And like the rest of us on this side of the houseI am prepared to put my shoulder to the wheel and serve Newfoundland, no matter who is the government of the day, and assist my fellow-men to get out of the hole we have got into, whether through mismanagement or what. If this is not done I may be able to say what is going to happen. Most of those on the government side of the house do not know much about the matter, but I believe the hon. minister of marine and fisheries knows that the statements I have made are absolutely correct.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES—May be you would appreciate a coalition government.

SIR JOHN C. CROSBIE—I wish no coalition government. I had enough of that. I do not wish to be in the government no longer as far as I am personally concerned. But whether in the government or on the opposition I am ready and willing, if it is necessary, to give my services to the country. And I am prepared to do my duty if called upon in a fearless manner because of those who sent me here, and no defiance that will stand before me will prevent me from doing so. I ask the hon. minister of marine and fisheries, as he is the only

person in the government who knows anything about the matter, if the salt position to-day is not very serious. I appeal to the hon. gentleman on behalf of the prime minister, on behalf of the government, to get together and try and get the salt position secure or we will not be sure as to what may happen.

I have no unkind word for the acting minister of shipping, Mr. Cave, but I do regret his position. I regret his position as acting minister of shipping, in which position he is not one of the executive council. He has not got the same as his executive brothers and those associated with him. I wish to call the attention of the government to this fact that the shipping question is more serious than they understand. It is of more serious moment than they give credit to. The hon. the minister of shipping wants every assistance possible from the executive government to carry out his tasks.

The coastal service requires great consideration and I want them to do something in this matter. I want them to lay upon the table of the house the plans which they suggest to carry out so that I may be able to give them any just criticism which they may deserve. I am waiting for this bill to come before the house so that I may criticise it if necessary. If it is all that can be desired then it will have my hearty support. I appeal to the Prime Minister and Eecutive Government and their associates and state that the position is really serious and demands immediate attention and the quicker the better, and I prophesied before it will not be far away when the Black Monday which we never dreamt of will be upon us.

Now firstly, as to the salt question, it is essential that sufficient salt be procurred, as it is necessary for the fishermen to produce the codfish. Secondly as to coal, some desperate attempt ought to be made to get some steamers to carry coal down here from the Dominion and Scotia Companies if we are to avoid a repetition or more than likely something worse than last winter, which was bad enough for anybody. Thirdly, some extraordinary effort should be made tc improve the deplorable coastal service, and the quicker the improvement is made the better. I am awaiting the coming up of thecoast al bill so that I can criticize it. I hope the leader of the government who, when a member of the Upper House criticised me because of the scandals I was committing as minister of shipping in the national government, will introduce a bill making it legal for Mr. Cave to act in his position according to his own dictates. I appeal to the hon. gentleman to seriously consider this matter before him and it is more serious than can be imagined.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—I wish to make some remarks in reply to the statements made by Sir John Crosbie re the salt question. Now the salt situation is, it is true, in a serious position, but not so serious as the hon. member announced to the house. The facts are somewhat like this: Since January up to the present time twenty thousand hogsheads of salt have been imported into the country. This is a large import under the circumstances because we have no steamers to bring salt in. There was remaining from last ten thouand tons available for the fishery of 1920. Our requirements are fifty-five thousand tons, so the balance of twenty-five thousand tons is still required for the present year's fishery, of course taking into consideration that the demands this season shall not be greater than last year's. Even when comparing the demand of this year with those of last year we will

not have the same consumption of salt as we have had for the past five years because of the herring industry. There used to be two to fifteen thousand tons used down in Green Bay in the herring industry. On the west coast there is more salt than is required, and there is such a large amount there that some of it is being purchased for consumption down north. But the situation is serious because we had anticipated that a couple of cargoes would arrive before the end of May, as we had sufficient stocks to last till then, but these have not arrived.

There is at present a strike on at Cadiz and we have steamers there awaiting to load salt, but there is no possibility to get it until the strike is settled. From this point of view it is serious. If that strike continues it will be a serious matter. The salt importers met and discussed the advisability of having these steamers go to other ports for the salt, but it was gleaned that none could be had except at Lisbon. Large qualities are available there, but the difficulty is in the handling of it. There is none at Santa Pola or Geneva. Salt cannot be got there at any price. Salt can be obtained from the Portugal markets and it only requires to get into touch with the right people at Portugal and we may get the salt importers to consider whether it is not better to send the steamers to Lisbon to load. Of course if we do not get it, there it is, just as serious as Sir John Crosbie made it out to be, and it will be serious until the steamers are despatched to Lisbon to load.

With regard to the coastal service my hon. friend has already learned that the government of the day has not been lazy in the matter but has been exerting themselves in every way, and that it is not very easy to induce people to enter into a coastal contract in connection with steamers. We have been trying to purchase steamers so that they may take up the coastal service. The government has been trying to charter ships to the Reid Newfoundland Company and has endeavoured to procure suitable steamers, but all to no avail up to the present. At present there are only two bay boats. We have not been able to secure suitable bay boats or steamers.

The coal situation to-day is more serious than 1917-18. The demand for coal to-day is great but there is only a limited supply. Two years ago we could get sufficient coal from the Sydneys, but it is not easy to do that to-day. We can get sufficient coal for Newfoundland's requirements but we cannot get the steamers to bring it down. The coal matter is a serious matter, but it should not prevent us from developing the coal resources at St. George's. There is a deposit up there of over two million tons and if it comes too serious we shall have to mine this coal. There is enough there for twenty years, and if hte Sydney people should not feel disposed to make a square deal for the supply of coal for Newfoundland the government ought to see to it that the deposit at St. George's is mined and placed upon the market. Whether it is necessary or not the coal ought to be mined. We do not know what Sydney intends to do on account of the tax placed upon the ore.

It is the intention of the government that the department of shipping shall go out of existence at the end of the year. They anticipated during the winter to discontinue the department, but as pointed out by the hon. member for Port de Grave the demands on this department had to receive the serious consideration which they necessitated, and as it is essential that we get Bowring Broth-

ers to take up the coastal service or else the government do it themselves the government ask for an extension of time for the minister of shipping : act and run the department. The de- department of marine and fisheries has enough responsibilit. Mr. Cave has had six monthrs' experience and ought now to know something about the department. No better man could be selected to work the department and an extension of time to the end of the year is asked for. Under the circumstances, as the hon. gentleman does not know what the decision of the court will be as to his return to this house, it was impossible for him to go to his district to be confirmed in his position as minister of ship- ping. He has done good work in the department. Of course he may not be able to fulfil the position to the satisfaction of the country in such an able manner as Sir John C. Crosbie himself. He has had the experience and Mr. Cave none at all.

SIR J. C. CROSBIE:—Mr. Chair- man, I quite appreciate the explan- ation of the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, but it is apparent that he does not understand the salt sit- uation as I do. He says that the stock required for this season is 55,000 hogsheads, but the local holdings does not exceed 5,000 tons. Bowring's and Baine Johnston's were the only concerns that imported salt last fall. Job's and Morey were afraid they would lose a few cents interest, and to-day they are drawing on Baine Johnston. I am told that our total stock to-day does not exceed 15,000 hogsheads. If I tell them that the situation is serious, they tell me that I am too pessimistci, and predicting another Black Monday. The supply at Lisbon is very limited. I question if they could load two steamers if the steamers were available. Now I'm going to tell you what to do, and I hope you will be sensible enough to do it. The minister of shipping has got to put restrictions on salt as quickly as he can. If the Cadiz strike is not over, even if we can get the steamers, there will be no salt to go north, and we will find in the month of July that the people of the kest coast will be sending to St. John's for salt. I suggest that we make some attempt to send down and get some salt at the West Indies. We ought to do it. I think that we can get the salt, but it can be easily found out by cable whether or not we can get it. Now that the fishermen know that there is a scarcity of salt there is going to be a rush on. We are practically to the first of June and without any salt worth while.

My hon. friend tells me that I will know about the coastal boats later. Well, I have been waiting two weeks already for some information, and I suppose I will have to wait longer. But my whole concern now is with the salt situation, and before the Government knows where they are the whole situation may tumble down over their heads.

Now with respect to the coal sit- uation. The hon. minister of marine and fisheries tells us that when the matter of taxation with respec to iron ore comes up he coal situation will also be brought up. The Do- minion Iron & Steel Company have nothing whatever to do with the coal situation. The Canadian government wants the coal to run their railroads, and if they demand it we are not going to get it. Send somebody to see if there is any coal there for us, and if it is there we ought to get it. If the coal is at St. George's we ought to go after it and get it. I would vote any amount of money to procure the coal at St. George's, but so far as I have been able to learn there is noth- ing there but water and rock.

It is part of the job of the hon. minister of marine and fisheries and mself to swap bouquets, but I am serious on behalf of the colony. Probabily I see the difficulties a little premature, a little ahead of somebody else, but we are facing a serious situation. If we are going to pass this bill, put Mr. Cave in the executive government so that he can do the job as it ought to be done. If you have nine members in the executive make it ten. We did it. I would not hold the job ten minutes without a seat in the executive government. I suggest that to the hon. the prime minister, feeling confident that the hon. minister of marine and fisheries agrees with what I have said.

In conclusion, gentlemen, I must ask you not to forget the salt situation and the coal situation. Think about it. If necessary stay up all night and think about it. Do something, and do it quick.

MR. WALSH—Just a few words in reference to the matter before the house to-day. I had no intention of speaking this afternoon, but I think I would be remiss in my duty to the district which I represent if I were not to take part in this discussion. With regard to the bill we are asked to discuss, it has been so well ventilated by the other members of the Opposition that it is hardly necessary to go over their comments. Any words that I may utter this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, towards any member of this house, will not be uttered in a spirit of disparagement with regard to these gentlemen. The whole bill is wrong and is only another step into the mud and mire of political expediency. With regard to the statement of Sir John Crosbie that the department of shipping is more essential than ever it was, I think I must disagree. While the war was on it was absolutely necessary to market our products, but now the war is over and I for one cannot see why this department should exist. It is true there is a great coal shortage, but to my mind the importation of coal plays no part in the duty of any government. We have in this town coal merchants who are not in the business, I am sure, for any philanthropic purpose, and who no doubt have made huge profits out of the business, and I cannot see why we should be asked to dig down into our pockets to assist these profiteering merchants. I understand that a bill is to be brought down here to deal with profiteering, and I am surprised that a number of the hon. members on the government side of the house have not protested against the further operation of the ministry of shipping. Its only duty at present is to assist the coal merchants in heir importation of coal and make further profits.

The same may be said of the salt importres. There were men in the trade then and they are in the trade now who were asking enormous profits on the different commodities required by the common people. The same requirements are being sold by the same men to-day, and if not at the same profits, I have no hesitation in saying at greater profits than ever before, so for this reason if for no other, I want to place myself on record as being opposed to the continuation of the department of shipping, if there is no more necessary work for that department than assisting the merchants in bringing in articles on which they can make big profits.

With regard to the Minister of Posts and Telegraphis I have very little to say. So far as the gentleman himself is concerned I have nothing but the greatest admiration for him. I feel sure he will do justice to the

position, to the employees, and to the country, but I do want to place myself on record, as deploring a state of affairs which has lost us the service of that eminently qualified gentleman, the ex-postmaster general. During the time he occupied that office, I don't think anbody can accuse that gentleman of having neglected his important duties, but I think that everybody inside this house and outside of it will agree, that he was a most efficient official, and it is unfortunate that the Hon. Mr. Halfyard, or whoever may hold the office of minister of posts and telegraphs, in the future, will not have the wise counsel, and practical experience of that gentleman, Mr. Robinson.

With regard to the department of education, it has been said that this is a department of mystery. In looking over the correspondence this afternoon, which was handed to the leader of the opposition, in reply to a question from him a few days ago, I notice that these appointments took place last December, and I notice that the minister of posts and telegraphs, went into harness then, but if as has been stated there are no duties for the minister of education to perform, it is inconceivable that that gentleman has been participating in any pay or emolument from this house. I am sorry he is not here to-day or I would ask him whether he has or not. I don't believe he has. Surely, if he has no work to perform, and if this house has not been consulted as to any work that may be assigned to him, I don't think the government would attempt to force on this gentleman any amount of money for services he does not perform. This would be creating another precedent, compelling a member of this assembly to receive money under false pretences.

Now if we are to provide some position for the hon. ex-minister of shipping, as I am told he has resigned, and I want to state, that I don't think that there is a more honorable gentleman inside this house or outside of it, and I for one would like to see him occupy a position and I think it is deplorable that this gentleman should be placed in the position he is placed in, by the bill which we are considering, why not create one more minister, and in the creation of another minister I am going to suggest to the prime minister that he will only be carrying out one of the many pledges he sent to the country in his manifesto, why not create a department whereby the bone and sinew of this or any other country may be represented. There is no such department and never was, and no more important one could be thought of. Why not instead of by act of parliament permitting him to independently hold his seat without going to the people for re-election, why not appoint him minister of labor for another six months, and then if you are not in a position to send him back to his constituency, pass on and give it to some other man.

It is well known that any man on the government side of the house is well qualified to take any position from prime minister down. Well then, it should be an easy matter to find some other man to take up the cudgels on behalf of the laboring classes, and then you can pass the hon. ex-minister along to some other position. Be that as it may, I avail of this opportunity to appeal to the hon. the prime minister, and to each member of the government, not to allow this house to close until you have redeemed that pledge which you gave in regard to a department of labor, and I want to assure the prime minister and his associates that anything that lies within my power to help this motion along I will do gladly, and

anything that will lighten the burden of the laboring classes will have my hearty support and cooperation.

Now whether it is wise or unwise that the coastal servce of this country should be controlled by the government is a matter that only time can tell. I would like to have the figures of the expenses of the boats controlled by the government from the tmie they were taken over by the government. It is only when we have these figures that we will be in a position to state whether from a financial standpoint the country has been getting better service by having these steamers under government control. I doubt whether government control of coastal boats will ever be carried out successfully.

During the war when transportation and railway service was taken over by the government in other countries, millions of dollars were lost, and it is only reasonable, because if these are taken over by the government, any government, there is always an army of government supporters who will be looking for a job. Sometimes the applicant may be qualified, and may be fully entitled to the position he applied for, but in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred it is not the qualifications of the applicant that count, it is the number of votes he may mean to the party in power. Now I don't refer absolutely to the present administration. It would be the case with any administration, and I don't think that under such conditions government control of coastal service can ever be successfully carried out. I would like to say with regard to our coastal service, I had hoped that at this session, and I still hope it, that some legislation will be brought in whereby a provision will be made for the large and important stretches of coast line throughout the different parts of the country. These very people who are labouring under those difficulties have to pay their proportionate part, with the man who has a railway running to his back yard, and a coastal boat stopping at his stage head.

Some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the house may say, this is the first time we have heard this from you. You are six years in this house, and why did you not try to get better coastal service in that time. In answer to that I would say, that at the first sesion of this house, when I had the honour to occupy a seat, from my place in this assembly, I pleaded that additional coastal service be granted the district which I had the honor to represent. However, as you know, Mr. Chairman, in August 1914, the great European war broke out, and that was the signal for no further expenditures for local improvements, and wisely so. All the money available was required to meet our war debt, and to keep the troops across. For this reason for the whole duration of the war, no member of the house, nor no person outside of this house, made any requests, for these very necessary facilities.

Now that the war is over and now that the government is installed in office, we should not allow this session of the house to terminate without having made provision for every section, every mile of our coast line from no matter what section of the island, and no matter whether the request comes from a representative who happens to be sitting on the government side or whether it comes from a man sitting in opposition. The request is a reasonable one, and I do not think that any hon. gentleman would, for a moment, stand up in his place in this house and state that the coast line between Trepassey and Placentia is not entitled to better coastal facilities nor would he state

that the coastline between Cow Head and Cape Norman is not entitled to better coastal facilities, and the same principle applies to any other section of the island. It is about time then that hon. gentlemen of this house woke up to the fact that important duties of theirs are awaiting adjustment; and it is about time that the attention of this house would not be taken up too lengthily in trivial matters as I have known. I have known the attention of this house to have been occupied for hours and hours in discussing minor matters and more important matters that the whole population is vitally interested in were allowed to stand over from year to year. Are we ever intending to make an honest effort to try and stay the numbers, nay, the thousands of our men who yearly emigrate from this country? Are we ever intended to make an honest attempt to try and make conditions at home for them such that they will see that the legislature is with them and that we are making an honest attempt to try and better their conditions? The other day, in reply to a question asked in this house, I was informed of the enormous numbers of our manhood who were packing their bags, so to speak, and getting out.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—There are nearly as many coming back.

MR. WALSH:—I hope they all will come back, we do not want to see them stay away. Now with regard to this statement I want to state that only two days ago a number of my own constituents came down here with their last year's catch of fish and they found conditions such in this city that they resented the treatment that was handed out to them by the fish buyers of St. John's. Out of ten men who came four made up their minds and bought tickets for New York. These are men who had motor boats and all equipment for fishing. Now this is an alarming state of affairs and no jocose matter. I think we ought to try and better the conditions of the fishermen if we want to keep them at home. I do not blame the present government for that condition of affairs. The hon. minister of marine and fisheries knows the truth of the statement that I have just made, and I think I am perfectly within my rights in further discussing this matter while this bill is before the house. This is a bill giving a department absolute control over the importations of salt, and salt is an article that our greatest industry cannot go on without. Now I think it is only fair and just, gentlemen, that I referred to brought down a large amount of fish that had been held over in Branch since last season. The reason why it was held there is because that settlement is such an out of the way place as regards communication. When these men arrived here I went personally and saw some of the fish buyers. There were only two merchants in town who would look at fish at all, one of them was the firm of Job Bros. & Co., who offered to take the fish and pay $11 per quintal for merchantable, as some of the fish was a little damp and there would be a drop on the price of it proportionately to pay for the extra labour entailed in making it merchantable. I went down on Job's wharf the day the fish was being landand I found that the fish was being sacrificed and the men's interests were being sacrificed. I make that statement deliberately and I will ask no better witness to the truth of that charge than the hon. minister of marine and fisheries. When I saw what was happening I told those men and advised them to close down and allow no more fish to go ashore

out of their schooner. I brought them to the Hon. W. F. Coaker whom I knew would see that they would get fair play, as I believed he would; and I believe now as I did then that if the position had been put up to him that he would have endeavored to prevent those men and others from being driven out of their own country to New York and other places. However, I brought a sample of the fish to his office and he agreed that I was right in stopping the landing of it. He promptly recommended me to a party with whom I could do better, but, unfortunately, we could not find any other buyers, with the consequence that the firm of Job's took all the fish and the men had to take for it what was offered them. Now I hope that bill will be brought down by somebody or that something will be embodied in a bill preventing in future a recurrence of this character.

To get back to coastal facilities I might say that I have an honest desire to try and induce the government to take into consideration the fact that we have up there in the district of Placentia and St. Mary's that I have the honour to represent a coast line extending all the way from Trepassey to Placentia that you might say is absolutely isolated as so far as coastal facilities are concerned. The Portia calls at Trepassey and her next port of call is St. Mary's. Now between these ports there are from ten to fifteen places not served at all. The next port of call is Salmonier. Between St. Mary's and Salmonier there are another dozen or more settlements, and important settlement, not being served. Placentia is the next port of call and between Salmonier and Placentia there are at least, from twenty-five to thirty settlements where a coastal boat never touches and these people in that area have to pay for the boat that runs to Catalina, Burin and all the boats the run everywhere else. These people have to pay their proportionate shares and they should be given some consideration, and I believe that they will before the close of this house. I asked a question this afternoon in reference to this same matter and I am not unreasonable enough to expect a reply now, but I am prepared to wait until a reply comes in; and I hope that when that reply does come in that the answer will be that provision will be brought down a few days hence to give those people in that important section of the Island what they are justly entitled to. Those people are not unreasonable in their demands and they resent the fact of any hon. member of this house having to go on his knees to any government for their just rights when they are called upon to pay dollar for dollar towards the upkeep of any of the public institutions, and institutions that they are not receiving any benefit from. It is only their just rights that they should be given consideration and I trust that they will be too.

Now with regard to the department of shipping, as I stated at first, I must disagree with the hon. member for Port de Grave, Sir John Crosbie, as to the importance of this particular office. So far as this salt situation is concerned I believe that with such a capable and energetic man as the hon. minister of marine and fisheries at the head of the shipping department a man who is interested in every ounce of salt and where it goes after it does arrive over here, that the purpose would be better served.

MR. BENNETT—Mr. Chairman, I have to express disappointment and disapproval at this bill. My friend, Mr. Higgins, spoke in a manner that expressed the conviction of a majority at least of the members of this house. The first paragraph of the

bill alludes to the minister of posts and telegraphs and the minister of education. The wisdom of the government in creating these two departments and the manner in which they were created opens itself to much criticism. The men were appointed to departments that did no exist. I presume they have been drawing their salaries from the date their appointment. I have no great objection to the principle involved, but there appeared to be no necessity for the departments.

The position of posts and telegraphs was under consideration for many years and I might say that to one who had the honor of occupying the office of colonial secretary and who was possessed of the knowledge to be derived there from, the absolute necessity of having in the executive government the head of the postal department, was well known and this was especially applicable as it had relation to the national government where one saw, as perhaps on no other occasion, the great advantages that were of this department in the executive government. But, sir, this pian under the regime of the present administration has received a blow at its very birth by the circumstances which were responsible for the forcing of the resignation of the estimable gentleman who, on the accession to power of the present government, was in charge of the postal department, a man whom none was more highly qualified, none more thoroughly fitted to administer the affairs of that important office. The loss of his services to the country was a great one, because the late postmaster general I know, took a deep interest in the affairs of the department over which he presided and he had just begun the work of remodelling the department, and I have no doubt that had he remained there but a few years he would have done an inestimable service to the country in the reorganization of a department which was in need of that attention which he was so well fitted to give it. I question very much, sir, if the present service warrants such a hope and I fear that unless wiser counsel prevail, unless we give rise above petty prejudices and give proper consideration to and hold in just appreciation the merits of the man rather than take into account his political affiliations, this department, or any other department for that matter, will fall into a deplorable condition.

The other department, the mystery department as it might well be termed, we know nothing about for all we have been told concerning it is that a department of education had been created. I am glad, however, that my old friend and colleague, Dr. Barnes, has been appointed to preside over it for whatever his duties may be, I do not know of anyone who is more capable than he of attending to matters educational, but the unfortunate part of it is that we do not know what his work will be. I presume that we will be somewhat enlightened on this point when the legislation dealing with his department is brought down and I might say that when it is it will receive the earnest consideration of this side of the house at least. The bill which is before us this afternoon, sir, is a whitewash bill in every sense of the word. We have in the past had examples of just what could be attempted in this way but this bill goes further than any other that has ever been brought in. The principle is justifiable under certain circumstances but this is asking too much altogether. I join with my colleagues in their expressions of appreciation of Mr. Cave's worth, in deed it shows the great value that is set upon his

services by the government when they are prepared to put an act on the statute book that will legalize his remaining in office after the time that the law, as it stands now, says that he is entitled to remain there, but while I appreciate the anxiety of the Government to retain Mr. Cave in this office, I cannot agree that the precedent is a wise one to establish. Mr. Cave, under this bill, will not be appointed to office under any commission from the Governor-in-Council but will be made minister of shipping by an act of parliament, and what is more he will be minister of shipping until the 31st day of December whether the government likes it or whether they do not and further, if the government went out of power to-morrow, I leave it to legal gentlemen if I am not right in the contention that Mr. Cave would still continue to be minister of shipping. If this can be done there is no reason why the government should not make him minister of shipping for the next four years. The case now before court should not be made an excuse for this sort of thing. We were told that a decision would be handed down in a few days and in the meantime the department could very well be looked after by Mr. Hall who has rendered such valuable service both under the present and the late administrations. As to the advisability of discontinuing the department after the end of the year, it is open to question. We have heard this evening, two members of this house who are supposed to be experts in matters of this kind, say that this is so. We have heard Sir John Crosbie say that the shipping department would be more necessary from now on than it was during the period of the war and the necessity of a strong and capable man at its head has also been emphasized. Now, if that is so, what hope have we after the end of December. The government contends that the same necessity for such a department will not exist after the end of the year as exists now, but I say that this argument is not consistent and the government should make some provision for the possible emergencies of the future, and should if no other course is open appoint another minister. I have no doubt that there are many members on the other side of the house who could readily acquire the knowledge that would be necessary to fit them for the office.

There's some underlying reason why this should be done. The bill condemns itself, as shown by the means resorted to continue the office. To extend the term of the existence of this department another six or seven months without any regard to the future, and to ask this house to submit to such a law is not creditable to the government, and is not acceptable to the members of this side of the house. In regard to the coastal service we are informed that it is under the consideration of the government. I think it requires serious and immediate consideration. The government have been looking for steamers and can't get the necessary ones. The two steamers now in use are inadequate. I heard the other day that a schooner had been employed to carry mails and freight to the district of Burin, and quite proper too. If we can't get steamers then let us have a few good vessels. There is a great demand for increased facilities in the coastal service and what department should look after this, if it is not the department of shipping. I agree with Sir John Crosbie that this department is more necessary to-day than ever it was. Great trouble has been caused that department by the irregularity of the coastal service and I think this de-

partment should be kept and looked after. In the city at present there is a continuous exhibition of lack of facilities in handling freight. Isn't it possible that something be done tc relieve the congestion at freight depots? People are being taxed day after day and outport and city residents have to bear the brunt. Is there no hope? Hasn't the minister of shipping any suggestion to make for the improvement of this situation. Some premises might be obtained. I know the late government had hopes of securing the Allan premises but this was bought before it was possible to obtain it. It may be possible to secure another premises in some part of the town if an effort is made to do so. This would save the present hardship that is so conspicuous in the city today. Some capable man should be placed in charge, and our very best resources developed to improve this situation.

In referring to the last section of this Act I think it should not be allowed to go to the statute book, it is vicious to the extreme and goes beyond the ordinary whitewash, by all means let Mr. Cave remain in his position but let him go to his district with the proper endorsation and not ask this legislature to legalize a law for that purpose. It is vicious in the extreme and should never occupy a place on the statute book.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN: — Mr. Chairman, I want to add a few words to this debate. I am sorry that I have to object to the passing of this bill, personally I would like to see the hon. minister retain his position, but I cannot support this bill. A few days ago a retroactive bill was brought in here and here's another that is objectionable. There's no precedent for this in any legislature. Here we find ourselves passing an act contrary to all and every act on the statute book. Why should this be done? There's a great majority of men on the other side of the house and men who are competent to take this position, and there's no reason why we should be faced with this situation. We have heard from the hon. leader of the government that it is his intention to close up this department, but there's lots of work for the ministry of shipping at this time. If the conditions existing to-day are correct we might just as well have the department closed up for the past six months. Here we are to-day nearing the first of June and according to a statement made by Sir John Crosbie yesterday with only 15,000 hhds. of salt in St. John's. The caplin are practically on our shores from June the first to the fifteenth, and yesterday we were told that we are left with only 15,000 hhds. of salt to meet the summer's catch, and no hope as to what will happen to improve the situation in the next three weeks. He simply told us that there is at present a strike among the workers in Cadiz and if a couple of steamers were chartered now to load they would not be able to do so. We are now right in the hands of the laborers of Cadiz. I have gone around during the past week to several of the firms in town and I found that Bowrings and Baine Johnston's are probably the only two firms that have any salt at all.

If the ice was off the coast north of Capt St. Francis to-day there would not be a hhd. of salt left in St. John's. The northern bays are blocked with ice and it is just as well that they are because if the sfihermen were able to get here at present there would not be sufficient salt to give them. I asked the minister of shipping some time ago in reference to the salt question what was going to be done and he said that there was 30,000 tons in the country. But when

you come to take St. John's with only 15,000 hhds. somebody is to blame. When Sir John Crosbie was minister of shipping he was always on the job with regard to the salt situation and was constantly in touch with the shippers and firms to make certain that sufficient salt would be obtainable in the country when needed for the fishery. If the position is as grave as it appears to me then I don't know where we are as far as salt is concerned. June and July are the two principal months for the shore fishery and if we go short of salt during these two months the results will be disastrous. As far as coal is concerned we can always find a substitute, because in the outports wood is chiefly used for household purposes and St. John's is practically the only place to be considered. But, salt is the mainspring of 80 per cent of the industries of Newfoundland. If it is true that there is at present only 15,000 hhds. of salt in St. John's where are we going to land. There's no use in coming in here and introducing rules and regulations for the benefit of our fisheries if nothing has been done to secure salt. It is indeed a grave situation. I don't know if the minister can tell us of the existence of stocks at Halifax or St. Pierre which we could obtain in a hurry if necessary. At the present time we have but one twentieth of the required quantity. In St. John's last year we had as much as the whole Island contains to-day. One of the reasons given by the minister of shipping yesterday is that salt would not be in the same demand in the northern bays this year. Last year there was an exceptionally great herring fishery in the northern and western bays and this year the minister is resting content on the assumption that this will not be the case this year. Perhaps the hon. minister is not aware that he is forgetting and sidetracking an industry that is worth a million dollars to the colony. In his opinion the herring fishery is gone. With all the rules and regulations that have been introduced nothing has been done in this direction and one of our greatest industries is about to be neglected.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The chairman from the committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the hon. the minister of justice the bill entitled "an act to provide for the lighting of streets in the outports" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole house on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the hon. the prime minister, the bill entitled "an act to confirm a contract between the government and the Susu shipping company, limited," was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole house on to-morrow.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

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

The house then adjourned accordingly.

WEDESDAY, May 19, 1920.

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

Hon. the prime minister tabled the annual report of registrar general of births, deaths and marriages, 1919.

HON. MIN. MARINE & FISHERIES

—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the people of Open Hall, King's Cove and Keels regarding the modification of the Prohibition Act. The petitioners seek a modification. My own position is I will not support any modification of the act unless the modification comes from the supporters of prohibition. If they want to have the act modified it will be a pleasure for me to give it my support. I have a great deal of sympathy with the prayer of the petitioners asking that scripts be done away with, and that a bottle be given once in a while, but such a request must come from the prohibitioners,the people who have put the prohibition laws on the statute book. I have been trying to get some of the prohibitioners to do something in the way of modification. I do not think that these petitions will receive any support from this side of the house, unless the prohibitioners themselves become interested. One reason why I would like to have something done by the prohibitionists to supply a bottle once in a while in order to stamp out the making of moonshine. We cannot put machinery into effect to stop the manufacture unless something else is substituted for it, but the people who put the law on the statute must seek its modification and not the people who opposed prohibition.

Mr. Sullivan gave notice of question.

Mr. MacDonnell gave notice of question.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted. and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the house resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider certain resolutions regarding the exportation of codfish from this colony.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of committee.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Mr. Chairman, in submitting these resolutions I will endeavour to explain them briefly. The intention of the government is to appoint a board to carry out the fish regulations. This bill provides the machinery, and the machinery consists of five men. The minister of marine and fisheries will be president. one member will be selected by the Board of Trade, and the three remaining members will be selected by the Governor-in-Council. The duty of the board will be to advise the Governor-in-Council regarding the export of codfish, the issuing of licenses. The board will regulate the terms upon which fish is exported, and the quantity of fish going to any market. With the rules as they are at present the minister has great powers, but under this act, discretionary powers are taken from him. He takes advice from the board by controlled opponents. The regulations may not be necessary this year, but the fact that we have an act is no reason why it should be used. It provides the machinery in case it is needed, and we would have saved a lot of worry and loss if we had the machinery during the past two years. The board will not have the power to issue licenses. Every exporter will receive a license who pays a fee of $50 for twelve months. It carries an additional tax of ten cents per qtl. on dry fish and five cents on soft fish. This money is handed back to the trade in way o expenditure for scientific research and inspection of fish if necessary and also in connection with the payment of trade agents. The government is now prepared to hand over $150,000.00 to be spent for this purpose. It will mean that $450,000.00 is taken from the trade as an export tax and license tax.

People will say that there is no need for this bill, but where I ask is the harm of placing a measure like this on the statute book? There are times when it is absolutely imperative to regulate the export of codfish, because there are times when eight or ten cargoes are being sent to the same market when two would be sufficient to supply the demands, and it will be readily understood that while with two cargoes going into a market like Oporto for instance, we would get a good price, eight or ten cargoes going into the same market, under the same conditions, must result in bringing prices down very considerably. I do not say that I should be prepared to do anything in this way as drastic as the measures that had to be taken last fall, for we all know the grave necessity that existed then for taking a firm stand on the matter of fish exports. Everybody was shivering in their shoes because nobody knew what was going to happen next, and things looked anything but hopeful for our getting out of an unpleasant situation without a great deal of difficulty and losses. Even the Government themselves when they went out of power, did not know where the thing was going to end, and I may say without fear of contradiction that they were hopelessly at a loss to know what the ultimate outcome would be. These conditions were brought about by the fact that a number of irresponsible men started selling fish to the Consorzio without any consideration as to quantity or requirements with the result that they were responsible for the cutting of prices and the general demoralizing of the markets.

A few days ago, when these resolutions had been drawn up, I submitted them to the trade with the request that they consider them and make any recommendations or suggestions for improvements that in their opinion would make the bill more effective in the general interests of the trade, but they condemned the resolutions although a large percentage of them had endorsed the regulations last fall and they passed the following resolution at the meeting held to discuss the matter of certain resolutions. I accepted their resolutions as to the price ofthe license and made it as they suggested, fifty dollars. The unfortunate part of it is that false impressions are created as to the probable effects of these regulations and we find someone writing in the Herald who goes further even than the objectors amongst the trade and says "only one supporter could be found for the proposed resolution and with this single exception resolutions were unanimously adopted to the effect that if anything of the kind foreshadowed were to be attempted all supplies would be stopped." Now there is nothing whatever in the resolutions passed at that meeting to that effect, but here is a definite statement gone broadcast, that has not a shadow of foundation in fact.

What I take exception to is that a report of what took place was not sent to the papers so as to avoid any such misstatements of this kind. As to the stopping of supplies, it will be found that the sooner this bill is passed the sooner will supplies be given out, for we know very well that people are not going to withhold supplies merely because steps are being taken to protect the export trade of our colony. Of course we will not have as much supplying this year as we had in 1918 or in 1919, and personally, I think that the curtailment of it to some extent would not do any harm. but so far as its being affected by the prices likely to be obtained is concerned, I would venture to state that we will get just as much for our fish this year as we got last year and for

Labrador No. 1 fish I believe that we will get more than last year's price. We must have a day of reckoning, it has to come sometime, and 1920 is as good a time to have it as any other. It is necessary that we should have such a day of reckoning every seven or eight years so that we may be able to see just where we stand. If we do have a short fishery, the fishermen will get good value for their catch, and if we have 1,300,000 qtls. this year we will get as much for it as if we had 1,500,000 qtls., and the men who would be catching the other 200,000 qtls. will be away making good money. I think the more fishermen there would be away from the fishery this year the better for prices generally.

Now with regard to our knowledge of the fisheries. Anybody who knows the facts are aware that we know nothing at all about them. Some years ago we had a man named Neilson come here to teach us something about them, but he was jaded by opposition to his work till he died and all efforts were negatived. The day is coming when scientific knowledge of our fisheries will be absolutely necessary and at present we know practically nothing in this respect. If one were to take the hon. members of this house down on a wharf to watch the tomcods swimming about, there would not be four or five amongst them who could tell you for certainty whether or not these tomcods could ever grow into large fish. The other day a petition came into my department with reference to the prohibition of fishing on certain grounds in the vicinity of Comfort Cove. There is very deep water in this particular place and it was a good ground for turbot. A man went out there and put down his trawl for turbot with the result that he found that there was an abundant of codfish there. The water was 200 fathoms deep and the fish had remained there all the winter. We know very little about the fisheries from a scientific standpoint.

What I propose is that a first class man be appointed as superintendent of fisheries and when the estimates come down you will find provision made there for $5,000 to pay such a man. The only difficulty will be in procuring him and whether we are to look for him in Canada, in England, or in Norway. Of course the best man is unquestionably to be found in Norway, but so far as I am concerned I would have some misgivings about bringing a man here from Norway to handle the investigating and scientific research of our fisheries because we would not want him to use the information that he would gather here to our own detriment. In Canada, there is quite a strong feeling with regard to the matter of research work of this kind and the sentiment there seems to be in favour of having it carried on in an international way. A conference is to be held in Vancouver in June to go into the matter fully and they have invited a representative of this colony to attend, but whether this will be possible or not it is difficult to say. I will not be able to go there. One of the subjects to be discussed will be scientific research. In this I think we ought to co-operate with Canada and work together because it would be greatly to our advantage to do so. Canada's fishery problems are practically identical with ours, and for that reason also it would benefit us to work in co-operation with the Canadian government. The boat Daisy which has been purchased from the British government is a trawler and when she comes here we can use her for the purpose of making experiments on our unknown fishing banks. I am informed that there is a considerable range

of banks extending from Baccalieu to the Funks and from the Funks to Belle Isle and we have heard of alien bankers going out there and getting big catches of halibut. Now if we could make some experiments with regard to this, it would well repay our efforts. We cannot expect private concerns to have their vessels make these experiments, but when we have this boat, we can have this done. I hope that we will turn over a new leaf in all these matters.

We know least of all about that from which we earn our living. Mr. Grieve speaking in the Upper House said that Mr. Howes and Mr. Job went to Port Union to discuss fish regulations with me last November. I must make an emphatic denial of that charge. Neither Mr. Hawes nor Mr. Job went to Port Union to discuss the regulations on November 1st. They went there wholly and solely for the purpose of visiting the plant and we did not discuss the regulations at that time. We had no idea that we were going to be returned at that time. But Mr. Hawes and Mr. Job did go to Port Union some time after, about November 18th, when we were in power and discussed the regulations wi me. They both gave me valuable advice in connection with that matter, and I think that the statements made in the upper house by Mr. Grieve are unfair. As far as Mr. Job is concerned, he has been of good use on the advisory board and has always been willing at all times to give the best advice in his possession regarding the fish exports. He is a most useful representative of the trade and does not spare himself in any endeavour to assist the trade or the country.

Now I do not put much dependence on the late resolutions of the Board of Trade, because they had previously met in March and had resolved that the regulations were good, and they did not want the price of fish fixed except by conference, and I do not see why we should meet all the exporters and discuss the price of fish from time to time. If you ask my candid opinion on these regulations, I would say that they should be enforced because they have this season benefited the Colony to a tremendous extent. Nobody knows what would have happened if these regulations had not been in force. In conversation with one of the men who attended that meeting on Friday morning, he said "Mr. Coaker, if you abandoned these regulations there is no knowing what would happen." I asked him if he were not one of the men who voted for these resolutions, and he said yes but he did not get a chance to discuss them and did not know where he was. I refused to go to the exporters' meeting because I said that it was a matter for themselves to decide. If you want to improve them, make any suggestion and if acceptable, I am only too pleased to consider their bona fides.

There's another matter I would like to discuss. Several bills have passed this house and have gone to the upper house and been referred to a select committee and all those bills are in the best interests of fishery conditions in this country. If the trade will work with me in promoting the interests of the fisheries I will be only too glad to co-operate, but if they fail to do this they can have the department of fisheries conducted in the future as in the past, a department for allocating marine grants and supplying lobster labels. I do not want to be there if they do not intend to co-operate with us. I am there because I think I can do some good in straightening out the kinks in fishery matters. If they do not help, I am willing to get out. So far as selling

my fish is concerned, I can sell it if they can. I have agents on the other side who can sell my fish at all times.

The resolutions and the whole bill were thrashed out with the trade; at first they were agreeable, but now they disagree. If they work with me I am ready to cooperate and I will goahead and do something to improve the conditions, and I am convinced if the country is to progress and prosper and place her export business on a sound basis, that much awaits to be done. The matter had become too serious to ignore. Yesterday I received a message from Spain containing the information that a firm had sent a shipment of Labrador and shore fish to that country, and that it had arrived there in a bad condition and been rejected. This fish we sold via New York. It has been dumped on the Spanish market at 50s. 6d. for the shore, which means a slump in prices all round in Spain and a loss to shippers of scores of thousands of dollars. Yet some say there is no need of regulations.

If any member of the Opposition can prove to me that these regulations will not benefit our cause in any shape or form, I will withdraw them, but I want positive proof. The country up to the present time has derived the benefits of hundreds of thousands of dollars from these regulations, and I seriously and confidently make that assertion. If they were not in force this season I doubt if we would be getting 50s. per qtl. for fish in Spain, Italy and Portugal.

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 to-morrow.

On motion this report was received and it was ordered that the committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of hon. the minister of finance and customs the house resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider certain resolutions for the amendment of the income war tax act, 1918.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of committee.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Speaker, in moving these resolutions I would like to say that it is the intention to keep this act in force for another year, with one proviso, and that is that there is now provision made for each child up to the age of eighteen years. There is an allowance of two hundred dollars off the income tax, for each child up to that age. That is the only difference that is made in it.

The business profits tax will be continued for another year with one or two points of difference. Instead of the banks paying the regular assessment they will pay one-half of one per cent. on all deposits, up to December 31st. We think that this will cover all difficulties in connection with assessment. The other change, provides for the elimination of Section 3, Clause G.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Chairman, I think it is only right that I should at once support this bill. I find that by a happening of the past few days I have secured for myself additional exemption of two hundred dollars. I trust we shall see that many of the hon. members of this house, will take advantage of the policy of the government, in encouraging them to take their proper places in the world. I support this bill also, because the amendment has really been a subject of considerable discussion for some time past. A great deal has been said of the unfairness of the law, which compels men with families to pay the

same as men who have no family. Apart from a personal advantage which this Bill gives me, I think iti s fair provision, and for that reason I give my support to it.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Chairman, although I am not in a position to support this measure for the same seasons as my colleague, Mr. Higgins, I do support it for other reasons, but I would like to see another addition to it, namely some provision protecting the men who are provident enough to put insurance on their lives. In Canada and in England, a provision allows a certain reduction, in proportion to the amount a man carries on his life. as although life insurance is a benefit to himself, it is also a benefit to the state, in as much as he prevents his family from becoming a burden to the state. I think that we ought to realize that in putting on an addition of this sort, we are giving a provident man encouragement, and I think we ought to consider well whether it would not be advisable to make some readuction for the man who benefits himself and the state in this manner. I beg to suggest to the hon. the minister of finance and customs that some such allowance be made.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Chairman, the suggestion made by the hon. member for St. John's East, Mr. Fox, is a very admirable one, and might be worked out in another session, in a way which might be equitable to the man who is as Mr. Fox says provident enough to insure his life, and thereby benefit himself, and the state. The matter is one well worthy of consideration, but it is impossible to consider any such change at the present time because it would necessitate a reorganization of the income tax.

HON. MINISTE OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS—Mr. Chairman, in reply to the suggestions from the Hon. Member for St. John's East, Mr. Fox, I would like to say that any such measure would place the assessor's department in a very peculiar position. I think it would take all benefit from the income tax to the country, if we were to make any provision for life insurance.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The chairman from the committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the said resolutions with amendment and recommended that a bill be introduced ~~to~~ give effect to the same.

On motion this report was received and adopted and the bill entitled "An Act to amend 'The Income War Tax Act, 1918'" was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of hon. the minister of finance and customs the house resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider certain resolutions for the amendment of the Business Profits Tax Act, 1917."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of committee.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—Mr. Chairman, I have nothing to say against the bill, but I fear that the taxing of the deposits in the Savings Banks may cause a reaction quicker than we would realise. In other words the financial world to-day and especially the banks are tightening up their strings and we might get, before we know where we are, a big shot from the banks by their increasing the interest on loans. The Bank of England to-day is up to 7 per cent. and it may go up to 8. I have no doubt to-day that if the matter was properly and thoroughly probed, that there is business done over the counters in our banks at 7 per cent instead of 6. I would like to draw the attention of the

house to the suggestion that I have made, as I think it is worth whil considering before any definite actio is taken in this matter. I know that when the last bill of this kind was before this house that it was optional for the banks to pay a profits tax o pay on deposits. They chose the former. It is a very difficult matter to try and get over the banks and I would like to say to the hon. minister of finance to be very, very careful and not have started a hornet's nest by an increase of the interests on loans.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—Mr. Chairman, there is no doubt but that the banks are hauling in. The banks in Newfoundland and in other parts of the world are experiencing unrest, and business generally is no enjoying the same boon as it was four or five years ago. Commodities were very cheap then compared to no and naturally when money was cheap and the banks were not as careful and did not take the same precautions as they are taking to-day. We are well aware that the banks are not going to be satisfied with what we do. Whatever we do will not meet their views and no matter what act was passed that controlled their profits they would not be agreeable to it. If they come back on the country and instead of charging 6 per cent. on loans charge 7 or 8 per cent., we can in return increase our rate on deposits. Like Sir John Crosbie, I am fully convinced that the banks here at the present time are not giving money at 6 per cent. and this is a well known fact to the business community. Ostensibly they are charging 6, but in reality charging 6½ and possibly 7. As I have already referred to, if they come back on the country and say we will not give you loans under 7 or 8 per cent., we will answer them by making them give 4 per cent. on deposits. During the war there was world wide agitation that the rate of interest on deposits in the banks should have been increased.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that under no condition can we force any man or men to pay 4 per cent. because I think it is beyond our powers entirely; and let me add that the day you try to do that by an act of the legislature you invite all the people to take their monies out of the banks. You will find that it would not be a sound move to attempt such a thing. The hon. finance minister, who is a business man—and I do some little business myself—must remember that the greater part of the trade of this country is done by people who get loans from banks, and if we do not get accommodated by the banks we cannot go on. Even the biggest of business men will sometimes have to call upon the banks to help them, and in my opinion the greatest and the biggest factor during the coming year, even when the Hon. Mr. Coaker and his regulations are forgotten about, towards fixing the price for 1920 fish will be the four institutions, known as banks, in this colony, so I would advise you to be very careful. The exporters of our fish have to rely upon the banks; and remember that the whole financial world is in a state of topsy turvy. As regards the charging of the banks one-half of one per cent., I would say that that is purely a matter for the finance minister who is in charge with the finances of the colony.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Chairman, I rise to say that I do not think there can be any conflict of opinion as to disputing the act of the government. What actuate mse in supporting the resolutions is because I am supporting the judgment of two administrations, because the suggestion of one-

half of one per cent. is not novel and the present government cannot be accused of it, and it is only fair to say that to-day's action is only a confirmation of the judgment of the previous administration. The 1917 act provided that as an alternative to paying the Profits Tax one-half of one per cent. on the savings deposits was to be paid. This proposal was acceded to and proceeded with and the banks decided to adopt the former course. Now the banks have apparently decided to escape the other method only to assume the cheapest way out for themselves. But the condtoins under which we live and with the estimates that the hon. minister of finance got to bring down and with the amount of revenue he has got to bring down and with the amount of revenue he has got to get to meet those estimates, I think that the government is justified in taking this step; and not alone ought we support the government in this thing, but I do not think that we can accuse them of having done anything in it haphazardly or too quickly.

MR. BENNETT:—Mr. Chairman, it has been stated by the hon. minister of finance and the hon. minister of marine and fisheries that the deposits in the city banks are between twenty-nine and thirty million dollars. If that is the case, this tax means a revenue of a hundred and fifty thousand dollars. Is the minister of finance in a position to inform me as to what were the profits tax paid by the four banks last year?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—Seventy thousand dollars.

MR. BENNETT:—Sho that this tax will mean an increase of eighty thousand dollars or twenty thousand each. The danger I see that may arise from this extra tax is that it may have the effect of the banks increasing their deposit rates. To-day I understand their rates are 7 per cent. and they might increase it to 7½, which would mean a very much heavier tax than we are called upon to pay to-day. That I consider would be a very serious and dangerous position, especially under present conditions whereby it would have the effect of embarrassing and retarding business in the country very materially . The amount paid by the banks in interest on deposits is 3 per cent. Under present financial conditions this is absolutely below what people should receive. As to the powers of the legislature to make that interest higher, as applied to all the banks, I am not in a position to state, but the legislature has this power that tehy can regulate the interest in the Government Savings Bank. I believe that it would be sound finance if the government would regulate and increase the interest paid on deposits in the Government Saving Bank. It would have the effect of increasing deposits there. At the present time the government bank is not receiving that cooperation and help which it should. Therefore if the extra tax is going to have the effect of the four banks increasing the rate on their deposits, or that they may reduce their interest on the deposits of the public, I say that the time is opportune to do something for the fostering and encouring of deposits in the Newfoundland Savings Bank and make that institution worthy of the country in which it is situated. At present it is an institution that is not doing the work that it should do. I think that the deposits yearly are decreasing rather than increasing. Certainly I do not think that they have got their proportion out of the twenty-nine millions of dollars that is said to be deposited in all the banks. I throw out the suggestion that the time is opportune and there is the greatest amount of justifica-

tion for it, for the government to increase the interest on deposits in the Newfoundland Government Savings Bank. I have no desire to oppose the resolutions, as I know that the Government requires the revenue, and I know that the other banks here have and are making large profits, as taxation here is not any greater than it is anywhere else.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The chairman from the committee reported that they had passed the said resolutions without amendment and recommended that a bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

On motion this report was received and adopted and the bill entitled "An Act to amend 'The Business Profit Tax Act, 1917'" was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Sir J. C. Crosbie asked that all correspondence be tabled in connection with the dissatisfaction expressed by the minister of posts and telegraphs over the post office at Broad Cove, Bay de Verde.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:— In the absence of the minister of posts and telegraphs I may say that the answer to Sir John Crosbie's question will be tabled tomorrow.

Mr. Walsh asked the Hon. the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government to place a coastal boat on that isolated section of the coast between Trepassey and Placentia, taking in the following settlements: Trepassey Bay, St. Shott's, Peter's River, St. Vincent, Gaskier, Pt. LaHayse, St. Mary's, Riverhead, Mall Bay, Regina, Admiral's Beach, Mosquito, Salmonier North, St. Joseph's, Haricot, Tickles, Colinet, John's Pond, North Hr., Branch, Pt. Lance, St. Bride's, Gustlett, Angel's Cove, Patrick's Cove, Ship's Cove, Barachoix, Pt. Verde, and Placentia Railway.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:— Owing to the shortage of coastal boats it is not probable that arrangements can be made for this season.

Mr. Walsh asked the hon. the Prime Minister if it is the intention of the Government to continue the motor mail and passenger service between Sound Island, Barron Island, Woody Island, and the eastern end of Merasheen to Long Island and Arnold's Cove to connect with railway.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:— Owing to the shortage of coastal boats it is not probable that arrangements can be made for this season.

Mr. Walsh asked the hon. the prime minister if it is the intention of the Government to place an additional coastal steamer on Placentia Bay.

HON. PRIME MINISTER: — The question is the same as your second; practically the same.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked the Minister of Justice to table a copy of the commission issued to the commissioners appointed to inquire into the "Woodford Affidavit."

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:— No commission has been issued. The judges have notified His Excellency the Governor that under the conditions they will come to no finding.

Sir M. P. Cashin asked the Hon. Prime Minister to lay on the table of the house copies of all communications between the food control board and the sugar importers relative to the sugar situation or the control of the sugar supply.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:— The chairman of the food control Board has informed me that the information will be available to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of hon. the prime minister, the house resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider the bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 4 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled Of Leg-

islative Disabilities and the Vacation of Seats in the House of Assembly.' "

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of committee.

MR. WALSH—Mr. Chairman, when the committee rose last evening I was just about to conclude my remarks. I would now like to add one more remark in reference to that free gift of a ship and the purchase of two others. I would like to make one more plea that due consideration be given men of the navy and men of the army in this connection. Some men have come to me and I have told them to make application to the department of shipping and also to the department of marine and fisheries, as I did not know which department would have charge of this matter. Only last night a man came to me who had spent five years overseas. He went first as an ordinary seaman, and later he was promoted to petty officer. Since his discharge he has gone to school and qualified himself as a master. There are others who are entitled to just the same consideration, and I have no doubt that just consideration will be given them. I hope that if any of these men apply and are qualified that the first consideration will be given them. I understand that there are already quite a number of applicants. The men who went overseas and sacrificed their interests in so doing should be given first chance. Having done their bit, if we are going to make any attempt to fulfill our promise to them when they went and when they came back their application will be given first consideration. If these men are ignored and it is our misfortune to read in the newspapers that another war has broken out, how can we expect that another rally will be met? If some civilian or party heeler gets the position ahead of the returned man, the returned man will have to pack his bag and get out of the country. The fact that this man to whom I referred was promoted in the British navy should be sufficient proof of his qualification. This is all I have to ask, and I am sure it is not too much. I hope that when this matter is up for consideration, the men who have fought for their country will get first consideration.

MR. FOX—Mr. Chairman, might I ask the gentleman in charge of this bill what exactly are the positions of Mr. Halfyard and Dr. Barnes at present.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—They are acting minister of posts and telegraphs, and acting minister of education respectively.

MR. FOX—Were they elected as such?

MON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Yes, after they received their appointments they vacated their seats and went back to their districts for re-election. If you would refer to the old act you will find that these offices were not included in those privileged under section 2, sub section 1. In the bye-election in St. John's West I found myself in the position, owing to changes made in the act during the war, that I could not seek re-election as premier for the same reason and I went back as colonial secretary.

MR. FOX—I support the provisions of this measure in so far as it offers protection to the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs and the Minister of Education and I think that in this we might even go a step further. Under the English Act, as you are aware a penalty could be imposed if these gentlemen sat in the house and vote without the proper authority and the mere fact of their resigning their seats and taking acting appointments would not alter the position in the least. Under these circumstances,

might it not be well to have inserted in this bill a section that would provide these gentlemen with further protection. As to section 3, I must register my protest against anything of this nature being enacted. If it is thought necessary to abolish the ministry of shipping at the end of the year why not say so in a straightforward manner. As to Mr. Cave himself, I can only endorse what has already been said with regard to his capabilities, and I rceognize the fact that he is a most suitable appointee, but if the Government desire to retain Mr. Cave's services could they not get over that difficulty by appointing a nominal head of the department and give Mr. Cave the actual control of affairs, and he would then be able to carry out the duties of his office without the necessity of any such irregularities as must exist under this bill. I really think that we should endeavour to protect the constitutional policy of the country as far as possibly and it does not seem to me that an act of this kind would be in the best interests of this house. I would like to draw the attention of the Hon. the Prime Minister to the possible effect of the words in the concluding part of this section, "It shall be lawful," and might I not submit that some words be used in place of these which would render this part of the act less binding, on the assumption, of course, that the government does not see fit to take the other alternative of appointing a nominal head. It must not be forgotten that this will now become a statutory appointment which would mean that Mr. Cave would be holding down an office from which it is extremely doubtful he could be removed even on the dissolution of the Government.

Since it is necessary that this bill be passed, might I not suggest that some other words be used in place of those to which I refer as being objectionable. I know that it is not the intention of the Government to purposely create a situation of this kind but to avoid complications by having the verbiage of the act making it obligatory to retain Mr. Cave in the porfolio of shipping, no matter what change of circumstances came about, I feel sure that the Hon. the Prime Minister will readily agree to having the necessary change made.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—The words "subject to the pleasure of His Excellency the Governor" could be inserted and then the Governor could discharge him at any time he saw fit.

MR. FOX—That would meet the difficulty.

DR. JONES—Mr. Chairman, I must confess that the debate on this bill has become slightly puzzling because of the wide area that has been traversed and the many subjects treated therein, but Mr. Cave, I understand, is the man the retention of whose position we are asked under this bill to sanction. His position, it seems to me, is a peculiar one. He has been extolled in one breath by the members on this side of the house for exceptional qualifications as a minister of shipping, while in the next breath his department is denounced for the lack of results that have accrued from its operations, and I do not consider that it is either fair or logical to separate the man from the department, for the one must be judged according to the other.

The discussion on this matter reminded me of the pirate story in which it is told that a certain pirate chief was the mildest mannered man that ever cut a throat. My only experience of Mr. Cave has been to hear him speak in this house on one or two occasions, but from this I can say with truth that he is the mildest

mannered man who ever held the portfolio of minister of shipping. Mr. Cave, in my opinion, has not lived up to the requirements of his position, and we have the evidence of this in the statements that have been made here within the past day or two. We are told that the country is threatened with a salt famine and surely one can conceive of nothing more disastrous to this country than a salt famine just now. It can only be regarded as hypocritical to be passing law restricting the fishermen, ordering them to cure their fish in a particular manner and to sell their fish only through certain specified channels and in certain ways while at the very time we are doing this there is nothing with which they can cure their fish when they do catch it. Surely when such a condition exists there must be poor management on someone's part to account for it. If the rivers at Grand Falls were suddenly found to be teeming with fish and the people there gave up paper making and went catching it, there would be some excuse if it was found that there was no salt to cure it, but in the present case there is no excuse whatever for the situation which confronts us. The position is a serious one and it does not reflect much credit upon the Minister of Shipping.

Sir John Crosbie who has had a wide experience and a great deal of knowledge in matters of this kind says that there is practically not a fortnight's supply of salt in the country, while on the other hand Mr. Coaker, who is equally well versed in this respect, tells us that there is no cause for alarm, but admits that the position is serious, and if this is so somebody must be responsible. If under the circumstances Mr. Cave cannot be retained in his position in the usual way, would it not be possible to find in the ranks of the government some other man capable of filling the office? As our friend, Mr. Archibald, who is also a townsman of mine, has told us, the government are two to one as compared with the Opposition and it is strange if a man capable of filling the position could not be secured from amongst so many if Mr. Cave is not willing to risk going back to his district for re-election.

HON. MINISTER OF SHIPPING—I am in the same position that you are. My election is still awiting the decision of the courts.

DR. JONES:—I am prepared to go back to my district to-morrow, if necessary, but at the same time I do not see why we should have to alter this act merely for the purpose of retaining Mr. Cave in his office beyond the time he is legally permitted to remain there, when there is such an abundance of material to chose from, and if we follow on in the manner in which we have been going thus far I believe that this session of the legislature will go down in history as having been marked by the amount of freak legislation enacted.

We have already occupied a great deal of time here when many of us myself included, are anxious to be at home attending to our work, but while this kind of thing goes on vigorous opposition must be expected and if this House was not asked to pass such measures as the one now before us, it would be found, I think, that the work of the session would go on very much more quickly.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Mr. Chairman, I want to add a few words to this debate. I am sorry that I have to object to the passing of this bill; personally I would like to see the hon. minister retain his position but I cannot support this bill. A few days ago a retroactive bill was brought in here and here's another that is objectionable. There's no precedent for this in any legislature. Here we find our-

selves passing an act contrary to all and every act on the statute book. Why should this be done? There's a great majority of men on the other side of the House and men who are competent to take this position, and there's no reason why we should be faced with this situation. We have heard from the hon. leader of the Government that it is his intention to close up this department, but there's lots of work for the ministry of shipping at this time. If the conditions existing to-day are correct we might just as well have had the department closed up for the past six months. Here we are to-day nearing the first of June and according to a statement made by Sir John Crosbie yesterday with only 15,000 hhds. of salt in St. John's. The caplin are practically on our shores from June the first to the fifteenth and yesterday we were told that we are left with only 15,000 hhds. of salt to meet the summer's catch, and no hope as to what will happen to improve the situation in the next three months. At present there is a strike on among the works in Cadiz and if a couple of steamers were chartered now to load they would not be able to do so. We are now right in the hands of the laborers of Cadiz. I have gone around during the past week to several of the firms in town and I found that Bowring's and Baine Johnston's are probably the only two firms that have any salt at all.

If the ice was off the coast north of Cape St. Francis to-day there would not be a hhd. of salt left in St. John's. The northern bays are blocked with ice and it is just as well that they are because if the fishermen were able to get here at present there would not be sufficient salt to give them. I asked the Minister of Shipping some time ago in reference to the salt question what was going to be done, and he said that there was 30,000 tons in the country. But when you come to take St. John's with only 15,000 hhds. somebody is to blame. When Sir John Crosbie was Minister of Shipping he was always on the job from the first day of January with regard to the salt situation and was constantly in touch with the shippers and firms to make certain that sufficient salt would be obtainable in the country when needed for the fishery. If the position is as grave as it appears to me then I don't know where we are as far as salt is concerned. June and July are the two principal months for the shore fishery and if we go short of salt during these two months the results will be disastrous. As far as coal is concerned we can always find a substitute, because in the outports coal is chiefly used for household purposes and St. John's is practically the only place to be considered. But salt is the mainstay of 80 per cent. of the industries of Newfoundland. If it is true that there is at present only 15,000 hhds. of salt in St. John's where are we going to land. There's no use in coming in here and introducing rules and regulations for the benefit of our fisheries if nothing has been done to secure salt. It is indeed a grave situation. I don't know if the minister can tell us of the existence of stocks at Halifax or St. Pierre which we could obtain in a hurry if necessary.

At the present time we have one third of the required quantity.. In St. John's last year we had as much as the whole island contains to-day. One of the reasons given by the Minister of Shipping yesterday is that salt would not be in the same demand in the northern bays this year. Last year there was an exceptionally great herring fishery in the northern and western bays and this year the minister is resting content on the assumption that this will not be the case this year. Perhaps the hon. minister is not aware that he is forgetting and sidetracking an in-

dustry that is worth a million dollars to the colony. In his opinion the herring fishery is gone. With all the rules and regulations that have been introduced this year nothing has been done in this direction and one of our greatest industries is about to be neglected.

Nor do I take it that he is willing to let the herring fishery go by default. This fishery means one million dollars to the colony. He stated that we don't need as much salt this year as last year. This means that the herring fishery has become a blank within the last twelve months. It is the place of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to put some of the energy he is putting into other matters into matters concerning this important industry. And now exhort the Minister of Shipping to be in a position to tell us in the next forty-eight hours, what salt is in this country, or at least in St. John's. If there is only fifteen thousand hogsheads of salt in here at present, then is the Minister of Shipping in a position to tell us what he has done to remedy this condition of affairs. Did he enquire of the planters, and merchants, to find out if possible the exact position as far as salt is concerned. To my mind it is one of the most serious things that has occurred in the country for a number of years. Here we are near the first of June and there is no salt in St. John's and none coming. Is the Minister of Shipping carrying out the promises he made to the people of Bay de Verde last year? The Government don't care to point out the faults of others last year. It was the sins of the Government of the day that they put before the electors last fall together with false assurances and succeeded in the election, and here they are to-day sitting down and resting contentedly and the principal industry of the colony endangered, in fact the only permanent industry we have today, and then we are told by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that we won't need as much salt this year as last year. Men are leaving the country by hundreds, and it is not a good thing to have them leave here. This is what happened in 1905 and 1906. Men left and went to Gloucester and Boston as well as parts of Nova Scotia. It is true that some of them came back. Some had to return because their wives and families were here, but there were a lot who did not come back. Well, now, are we going to get back to that position again? It looks like it to me.

There is another matter. We are here a month now, or will be in a few days, and yet we have had no important legislation except one or two retroactive bills. It is now nearly the first of June and the Government are in power since last November. We were going to have everything up to date. We were going to have the House open in January, or at the latest, February. It is now the 20th of May, and as yet there is no legislation in the interests of the fishermen of the colony. We cannot even get our public accounts brought down. That is not in keeping with what was promised the people of this country last year. We were told by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as far as the coal situation was concerned, that if we did not and could not arrange for coal from Sydney we could get it in Newfoundland. He said that there were two million tons of coal in St. George's, and if necessary we could get that. How do we know that we could get it? We have a certainty that there is coal there, but I doubt very much whether there is sufficient of a commercial nature, and even with coal there, and our men leaving the country, you will have no labor to put in the coal fields. Now what do the Government intend to do as far as coal is concerned? Do they intend to make an arrangement with the Dominion Iron & Steel Co., of

Sydney. They are in a position to do so if they wish. The position as far as the Dominion Iron & Steel Co. is concerned, is that they are wondering what tax is going to be placed on the ore yields from Bell Island. I don's know what the Government have decided yet, but I understood that it was the intention to put one dollar a ton upon the ore from Bell Island. Then surely if they can put one dollar a ton upon the ore, it will be easy for them to make arrangements with the Dominion Iron & Steel Co., as far as coal is concerned. Today we find that quite a number of our boats are held up in Sydney and cannot get coal. Now I would like to know if the Minister of Shipping has got in touch with the Dominion Iron & Steel Co., with reference to coal for these steamers in Sydney. Do I understand that the Minister made arrangements to have these vessels loaded? In the past there was an arrangement made by the Government that when we seent a steamer to Sydney there was no delay in loading. Now under existing circumstances I take it that it is an easy matter for the Minister of Shipping to make arrangemeents with that Company, because you have the power here to legislate with reference to the Dominion Iron & Steel Co. You have in Bell Island one million tons of ore a year, and you want a revenue from it, and you have to handle it carefully. You cannot do what you like with it. We may put ourselves in the position of killing the goose that lays the golden egg. If you tax Bell Island out of existence, you are throwing out of work 75 per cent. of the men of Conception Bay, who are earning their bread there. I am sure that legislation will come, but the only legislation we have had so far is one or two bills of unimportance. One was to return to certain individuals sums of money that they were not entitled to, and that was about all. Another retroactive bill was to put a man into the House of Assembly that the voters of the country did not put here, and who is not prepared to go back to his constituency for re-election.

Now there is another matter, one of the most important matters referred to by the present Government last fall, and that was the railway. The dangerous condition of the railroad was continually held up day after day for two or three months last fall. We were doing our best up to the time that we left office. We did our best while the war was on, and up to the time we were defeated, but we had no power from the people to pass any legislation in this respect. The present Government went to the country and placed before them the railroad position, and told the people how we were neglecting things. Now we are here a month and we have had no satisfactory information. The only thing we received was an answer from the Prime Minister to a question in which he says that a commission has been appointed to inquire into this matter. Is that sufficient answer? If you, Sir, are going to do anything this year, is it not time now to decide what you are going to do, and get to work, because you have to get to work this year or next, and the question you will be confronted with is, where are you going to get men to work on that railway? You cannot hold back until November, or December, and then put men on that railroad, and get only half value out of it. You all know quite well that you have to tackle that proposition, and the quicker you do it the better. Mind you, I am not finding fault or trying to criticise, but you have to do it. Whether you take it from the Reid Nfld. Co., or whether you make arrangement with the Reid Nfld. Co., you are up against it, and the Colony has to pay the bill. You have to do something to improve the conditions of that railroad, and you are saying to

yourselves, if we do that the people will blame us for spending money on the railroad, for paying the Reid Nfld. Co., and you are not strong enough to come in here with legislation and pass a bill to put that railroad in first class condition.

That road has got to be put in shape. It will take millions of dollars to do it and it will take years to do it. What are you going to do about it? Thousands of men are leaving this Colony. Are you going to bring Chinamen and Italians here to do the work? You have the work to be done and you are offering nothing to your own men. Are you prepared to bring in legislation for work to be done and which should have been done three or four months ago. These are matters that are troubling the country and the people at the present time, and not whether Mister Cave or Mister somebody else retains his seat or not. Now we are the agents and the servants of the people of this Island and I for one am prepared to come in here and vote anything within reason to carry on this railway work or coastal work o rany public work that will be for the betterment of the whole people of this Colony. And way shouldn't I? That's what the people sent me here for. I have nothing personally to gain by seeing that these public works are properly operated. That in the position that I stand in today. We are here day after day discussing and losing time over a lot of nonsensical bills. Not one practical bill of any importance has as yet been brought before the House. But what capped the climax is when I picked up the order paper the other day and saw that an act respecting mid-wifery was about to be introduced. I can quite understand this being on the order paper because in answering a question concerning the Woodford affidavit the Hon. Minister of Justice replied that it was an abortion. Now that is the kind of legislation we have been up against the past month.

As far as the coastal service is concerned, the people are already saying that they are in the same old position. As soon as the Government were elected to power last fall they ran an advertisement in every paper for three or four months calling for tenders for coastal boats. The people who elected you thought then you were serious and that you were going to have a good coastal service, but in answer to a question two days ago we were told that you had no response whatever to this advertisement. Well here we are at the old see-saw game again. The whole country is virtually tied up now as regards the railway and coastal boats. Take the position of the steamers Prospero and Portia. The Portia has been at the dry dock for the past two months undergoing repairs and she will certainly be there for at least another six weeks if the amount of work that has to be done on her is accomplished. Tnat means tsat the coastal service on the south west coast is abandoned. The prospero is now in commission north, but she cannot do half the work demanded from her. We are told that the Reid Nfld. Co. had an agent on the other side of the water trying to purchase a steamer, but up to the present time neither the Government nor the Reid Nfld. Co's agent have secured a ship for coastal work. If we are intended to step forward, surely we cannot make much progress unless there is some encouragement in that direction. You will find day after day congestion everywhere as regards the ioastal service. You go to the Reid Nfld. Co's premises and you will find practically all the bay boats tied up, so that the coastal service is on the rocks, and the country will be on the rocks if something is not done and done quickly. It was only the other day that the railway was opened

through to Port aux Basques. Not in my memory since the railway started have I seen that to happen before, and for the ten years that I was a member of the People's Party and the Amalgamated Party it never occurred. It was always possible to get from here to Port aux Basques, especially during the season of spring. It appears that ever since you came into power everything has been hoodooed and one trouble has happened after another. Now we are prepared to assist you, not for your sake but for the sake of the people and for the sake of the country.

Now take the road grants again, I want to get back after my old friend, the Minister of Public Works. We are now nearing the first of June and there has not been a dollar allocated to be spent on the roads throughout the Island. When he was in the amalgamated government he was in the position that he could spend moneys on roads on the first of May, if it suited him. Take the western districts. They are all clear of snow and frost now. In the district of Placentia and all the other western districts the money has to be sent out in the early spring, because after that all the men are gone fishing. I heard the Minister of Public Works say that no moneys would go to Placentia district this year until a road board would be appointed, under the local affairs act, and that the board would have the spending of all moneys but I would like to ask him what steps he has taken as yet towards the appointment of a board. Let me point out to him that the moneys for the district in the past, if not voted, were sent out by arrangement between the Government and the Board of Works Department on the first of May every year. That applied to the districts of St. John's East and West, Hr. Main, Hr. Grace, Ferryland and Placentia. Up to now there is not a dollar available to be spent on roads in these districts. In the district of Ferryland, as I pointed out the other day, we have road boards in every part of the district. I think the same road boards have been there for many years and they always, as far as I know, did good work for the money they got. The total grant for Ferryland, from the Goulds to Cape Race, was $1200, covering a distance of about seventy miles of road. There has been no money touched for that road yet, except for a few bridges that it was impossible to get over. As far as local road money was concerned, one-third of the amount used always be kept back in the Board of Works office and sent out automatically. This year, by order of the Minister of Public Works, no money would be sent out to be spent until boards would be appointed, under the Local Affairs Act. But you have not yet made any move to appoint boards. What is everybody's business is nobody's business. You gave us an excuse for not having an election, but you have lots of time to amend the act. Surely you are not going to sit here and wait for an amendment of the act before you allocate moneys for road work. The minister sits here in the House and does not know who got the $1200 that he sends out, although he repeatedly said in this House that he was not going to do anything that was not above board. In his estimates there is mentioned $1200 for a washout that never existed. You sent out $1200 and you are not in a position to tell to whom you sent it or by what authority. You did not do it off your own bat and you did not do it on the advice of anybody. We are now asking for $1200 to do the work before all the men are gone to the fishery, because by the time the election comes off, two months from now, all the men except a few stragglers, will be gone. In Ferryland during the past two or three weeks we could not get

men to go to work during the spring of the year for the amount of money paid by the boards. You must remember that thousands of people are to be considered in this matter and the money is there to be given out for the workintended. And remember you are only sent here as a servant of the people, to do as you are told. We do not come here to be snarled at, but to do our duty in their behalf. Iserve notice on you now, sir, that it is about time that the money for Ferryland district is sent out. I take it that the hon. gentleman must be misinformed in some direction as far as Ferryland is concerned, because the men who spent money in the past, spent it honestly and well.

I must say that as far as family grants are concerned that I never found any of them in Ferryland district, and if you dispute that statement you can look over the records and find out for yourself. I never heard of a man who asked me for a family grant, and the Hon. Minister of Public Works can go to his department and find out if this statement is correct or not. I think your proposed action is an insult to the boards. How do you know whether every board is properly constituted o rnot? Why do you now amend the Act? We are passing all kinds of acts here within the past two or three weeks. We will fix that Local Affairs Act here in an afternoon if you want it. I hope it is not the intention of the Government to spend money in the fall of the year. If it is that money will be only a waste.

That road has got to be put in shape. It will take millions of dollars to do it and it will take years to do it. Thousands of men are leaving the country. Are you going to bring Chinamen and Italians here to do the work? You have the work to be done and you are offering nothing to your own men. And you are not prepared to bring in legislation for work to be done now and which should have been done three or four months ago. These are matters that are troubling the country and the people at the present time and not whether Mr. Cave or Mr. Somebody else retains his seat or not. Now we are the agents and the servants of the people of this Island and I for one am prepared to come in here and vote anything within reason to carry on this railway work or coastal work or any public work that will mean for the betterment of the fishermen of this colony. And why shouldn't I. That's what the people sent me here for. I have nothing personally to gain by seeing that these public works are properly in operation. That is the position that I stand in to-day. We are here day after day discussing and losing time over a lot of nonsensical bills. Not one practical bill of any importance has as yet been brought before the House. But what capped the climax is when I picked up the order paper the other day and saw that an act respecting midwifery was about to be introduced. I can quite understand this being on the order paper because in answering a question concerning the Woodford Affidavit the Hon. Minister of Justice replied that it was an abortion. Now that is the kind of legislation we have been up against the past month.

As far as the coastal service is concerned, the people are already saying that they are in the same old position. As soon as you were elected to power last fall you had an advertisement in every paper for 3 or 4 months calling for tenders for coastal boats.

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.

On motion for the adoption of the report Sir M. P. Cashin moved and Mr.

Bennett seconded that section 3 of the bill be stricken out.

Whereupon the House divided and there appeared for the amendment Sir M. P. Cashin, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Vinnicombe, Dr. Jones, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Sinnott, Mr. MacDonnell, Mr. Sullivan (9) and against it Hon. the Prime Minister, Minister of Justice, Minister of Finance, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. Foote, Minister of Public Works, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Small, Mr. Cheeseman, Mr. Hibbs, Mr. Scammell, Mr. Targett, Mr. Guppy, Mr. Jones, Mr. Samson (16) so it passed in the negative.

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

Hon. the Prime Minister, Minister of Justice, Minister of Finance, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. Foote, Minister of Public Works, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Small, Mr. Cheeseman, Mr. Hibbs, Mr. Scammell, Mr. Targett, Mr. Guppy, Mr. Jones, Mr. Samson (16) and against it, Sir M. P. Cashin, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Vinnicombe, Dr. Jones, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Sinnott, Mr. MacDonnell, Mr. Sullivan (9).

So it passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly.

It was then ordered that the said bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Justice the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider the bill entitled An Act to Provide for the Lighting of Streets in the Outports.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs 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 said bill be read a third time 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 Department of Public Works" with some amendments in which they resuest the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister 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 respecting the Department of Posts and Telegraphs" with some amendments in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of the Hon. the Prime Minister the said amendments were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider the bill entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of a Contract with the Susu Shipping Company, Limited."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs 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 amendment.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the bill entitled "An Act to Check Profiteering"

was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole house on to-morrow.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:— Mr. Speaker, in moving that this bill be now read a second time, I shall take the opportunity of briefly explaining its provisions. I feel, sir, that this is not a party measure nor will it be regarded as such and for that reason I am sure that it will receive the hearty support of the whole House. If, when the bill is being considered in the committee stage, any suggestion that would have the effect of improving it in any way, coming from our honorable friends on the other side, will be welcomed. The first section of the bill empowers the food control board to investigate prices, costs, profits, etc., and for the purposes of which investigation they will be given the power to summon before them such persons as they desire to furnish information or produce any documents that may be required with a view to fixing maximum prices, and secondly to investigate such complaints as shall be made to them of profits being sought or obtained which, under the particular circumstances of the case, are held to be unreasonable. upon which investigation they may, first declare the price that would yield a reasonable profit or secondly, require the seller to refund to the person making the complaint the amount paid in excess of such price.

Section 2 provides that if, as a result of any investigation made on their own initiative or on complaint made to them, the board may find that a seller has charged or has sought to charge a price that is, in view of all the circumstances, unreasonable, they may take proceedings against such seller before a court of summary jurisdiction and on conviction, the seller will be liable to a fine not exceeding five hundred dollars or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months. For the purpose of this section a fair rate of profit shall be held to be that which is not in excess of the fair average rate earned by persons engaged in the same business as the seller in pre-war days. Section 3 provides a penalty for failure to comply with or any infringement on any order of the board and also for the recovery of any amount ordered to be refunded by summary procedure as in the case of a civil debt. Section 4 provides for the imposing of a penalty upon such persons as shall knowingly or recklessly furnish any information or make any representation which is false in any material particular. Section 5 is to the effect that when a person can be convicted under this act is a company, every managing director or other officer concerned in the management of the company shall be guilty of a like offense unless he proves that the act which constituted the offence in question was committed without his knowledge. Section 6 merely has to do with the costs in any proceedings taken by the board. Section 7 gives the board the power to take evidence on oath while section 8 explains what shall be understood be the terms "sale" and "seller" and provides that the latter term shall include persons offering for sale as well as actually selling. Section 9 provides that nothing in this act shall apply to the sale of articles for export from Newfoundland or to articles sold by auction. Section 10 empowers the governor in council to appoint boards with similar powers under the act as the food control board, except that of fixing prices, to act in the outports. Section 11 empowers the board to make regulations governing the constitution, powers and precedure of all committees appointed under the preceding section. Section 12 reads as follows: No member for the time being of the board or of any committee appointed under section ten of this act shall be sualified to act in any case

where he is a trade competitor of the person against whom a complaint under investigation has been lodged. The idea is to make it impossible for any person to investigate a complaint against a trade competitor.

Section 13 provides that whenever proceedings, founded on complaint, are being conducted before the board or before a committee, such proceedings shall be open to the public but such information or documents as may be required to be produced shall be regarded as confidential unless, of course, the case finds its way into court in which event it shall be of a quasi-criminal nature and the evidence will be at the disposal of the public as in other cases. There is also a clause in this section making it impossible for libel and slander actions in connection with investigations under this act, to be tried except before a court exercising judicial authority. There is one important section omitted from the bill which I shall read to the House for the benefit of honorable members.

(Insert section)

It is just possible that in certain small outports where there would perhaps be only one man doing business, a person making a complaint would be told when next he went to that store to make a purchase, be told that he could go elsewhere to procure what he wanted and the object of this section is to make it impossible for such a man to act in a vindictive manner against a complainant. This section will go in as 14 and section fourteen as the bill now stands will be made fifteen. This provides for appeals to the Supreme Court from the decisions of the board or committees. Section 16 reads "This act may be cited as the Profiteering Act, 1920," and shall continue in force until such date as the Governor in Council shall proclaim. This act has been drafted along the lines of the latest imperial legislation in this respect of which we have knowledge and with a view to meeting as far as possible Newfoundland conditions and I bespeak for it the support of the whole chamber.

MR. BENNETT:—I would like to ask Mr. Speaker if the members of the Food Control Board have been appointed yet.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Yes, the members of the board are Hon. A. W. Mews, chairman; Mr. J. J. McKay, Mr. McGrath, the late President of the L.S.P.U.; the President of the N.I.W.A., and Mr. H. W. LeMessurier.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Speaker, as the Prime Minister has said, there can be no difference of opinion on this bill, but one thing that strikes me at first blush is that well as the bill has been drafted and excellent tho its effects are likely to be, it might, because of the defficiency to which I am about to refer, become a dead letter. So far as I can see, there is nothing in the bill to ensure its provisions being carried out to that extent where its usefulness would justify its being placed on the statute book and I therefore propose that a section be incorporated to make it obligatory on the board to take action in all cases where action is warranted by the facts submitted in the lodging of a complaint or to give the man himself who makes the complaint or to give the man himself who makes the complaint power to take action. I take it that the government does not want to have this bill passed and the act placed on the statute book and then allow it to be forgotten or ignored, and I therefore see no reason why this precaution should not be taken, with this reservation, I support the second reading of the bill.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Speaker, while I appreciate the good intention of the hon. member for St. John's east, I think that he will find

that there is provision made in the bill against such a possibility as he refers to.

In reply to the objection raised by Mr. Higgins to the profiteering act that the board should be compelled to take action when a complaint is made, I think he will find that that is contained in the act. I have in my possession a whole collection of cases, where individuals complained they were being charged too much for certain articles. They took the proceedings necessary under this act and prosecuted the seller and in many cases received damages. I have in mind a case of a woman, who was charged one halfpenny 'a pint too much for milk. She made complaint to the board, they took the matter up, and the seller was fined $100. Once a complaint of this nature is made the food control board has full power to deal with it and they are bound to take action.

MR. HIGGINS:—But suppose they don't investigate it. I think our conditions here are different from those in England, and it must be remembered that there are wheels within wheels sometimes, and I think it would be wise to make it compulsory upon the board to take action.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—That can be done now but something can be inserted if necessary. If a man sends in a complaint, and the board refuses to investigate public opinion will force them to take steps in the matter, and anyway, a man can always get satisfaction by an appeal to the court.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice, the bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 86 of the Consolidated Statutes of Nfld. (Third Series) entitled 'Of Stipendiary Magistrates and Justices of the Peace'" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole House on to-morrow.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to amend Chapter 86 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland, (Third Series), entitled "Of Stipendiary Magistrates." Certain offences can be tried by stipendiary magistrates, but the offence amended is not provided for. In Section 10, Chapter 96, it provides that the magistrate may impose a penalty, but there is no power granted the magistrate to try the case. I understand that magistrates have been in the habit of trying the offence in the past, and I want to make it clear that they have power to do so, so that the object of this bill is to provide this.

MR. HIGGINS:—In light of the fact that to-day we have the children given special encouragement to come into this world, and the act concerning the registration of midwives, and in light of the bill which has just been introduced, I wish to compliment the government on doing the hat trick, as regards a certain class of life.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the bill entitled "An Act to amend Cap. 27 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (third series) entitled 'Of Death Duties,'" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole House on to-morrow.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—In moving the second reading of this bill entitled "Of Death Duties," I would like to say that the present section of the act provides that the court shall not grant probate or administration to any estate until applicant has produced certificates from the Minister of Finance and Customs that the death duties have been paid. I may say that the procedure is very much easier, and quicker, and somewhat cheaper, when applicantion is made to the court on circuit instead of at St. John's, but owing to the fact that it is impossible

to obtain receipts while on circuit, the result is that the administration cannot be granted, and this act provides that where application is made to the supreme court on circuit, they have the power to grant it, provided bonds are put up t othe amount of the value of the estate. If the duties are not paid within three months from the granting of letters of probate, they shall be revoked by the court.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the bill entitled "An Act concerning the Registry of Midwives" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole house on to-morrow.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:— Mr. Speaker, Lady Harris has for some time past been interesting herself in the matter of improved nursing facilities for the outports, particularly in midwifery cases. The object of this bill is to empower His Excellency the Governor in Council to make rules and regulations for the practice of midwifery by women. The Newfoundland Medical Act has already provided for the practice of miderfy by men. Lady Harris and some of the ladies of the Women's Patriotic Association have made arrangements whereby nurses will be placed in several sections of the country, the nurses' salaries being derived from fees received, a small minimum salary being guaranteed by the Government. I feel sure that this bill will receive the unanimous support of this chamber.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into committee of the whole to consider certain resolutions respecting the bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 137 of the Consolidated Statutes of Nfld. (thir dseries) entitled 'Of the Fire Patrol.' "

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:— Mr. Speaker, this bill entitled "Of the Fire Patrol" is a very short one. I note it contains a provision relating to a grant of money. Under these circumstances I ask the leader of the opposition if he will consent to the discharge of the order and permit me to immediately move the House into a committee of the whole to consider this matter in the form of resolutions.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:--That will be alright.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:— The object of these resolutions is to amend Section 23 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (third series) by striking out the words "Four Thousand Dollars" and substituting therefor the words "Six Thousand Five Hundred Dollars." This merely means that instead of the sum of Four Thousand Dollars being donated annually by the Newfoundland Government towards the expense of the fire patrol organized by the Anglo Newfoundland Development Company and certain other companies for the protection of some timber areas of the country, the vote shall be increased to Six Thousand Five Hundred Dollars. Even with this increased vote the amount contributed by the government is very small in comparison with the total cost. With the permission of the leader of the opposition and concurrence of the entire house I now move that the house resolve itself into a committee of the whole on these resolutions.

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 the said bill was introduced and read a first time and or-

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

Mr. MacDonnell gave notice of question.

Hon. Mr. Coaker gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled "An Act respecting Certificate of Masters and Mates."

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, May 20th, 1920.

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

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—I beg leave to lay upon the table of the Huose a copy of the public accounts for the year 1919.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I ask leave to present a petition from the Montreal Trust Co. asking that an act be passed to authorize them to exercise in this country the same business as they are engaged in at the Province of Quebec. I may say that there is now in the city a similar company, the Eastern Trust Co. doing business under the same act. I move that this petition be received and as it is a private bill it would be referred to a select committee for consideration.

The following select committee was appointed to consider the petition:—Hon. Minister of Justice, Mr. Scammell, Mr. Winsor.

MR. LeGROW:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the women of Newfoundland asking that they be given the right of franchise which up to the present it has not been their privilege to enjoy and which they are undoubtedly deserving of. The petition reads as follows:

This petition is signed by some 1,700 women amongst which are very prominent war workers, such as Lady Cashin, Lady Crosbie, Mrs. Browning and Mrs. Mitchell. I think it is about time sir, that this cause give consideration to such a petition that prays for the introduction of an act to grant to every woman the right of franchise whuch during the war they had certainly earned. The war work they did is an outstanding debt that we can never pay but in a small measure we may be able to recompense them and show our appreciation of their noble sacrifices for King and Empire and the lads "over there." The fact is sir, that when we went overseas to fight we went there in a great part to fight for our women. The municipal vote should have been granted to them long ago and in both municipal and governmental elections I am sure that in the future if the right that is due them be granted we will see a wonderful transformation in our political battles. Cleanliness and sanity will no doubt be their motto as far as the political fight is concerned and I trust that the department to which it relates will give this petition the consideration it warrants.

MR. SMALL:--Mr. Speaker I strongly support this petition presented by my friend the hon. member for Bay de Verde and sir, without a doubt the women of this country should participate in the elections of both the municipal council and the government. During the past four years of the war the women of Newfoundland have shown executive ability and have relieved many men from positions that were most strenuous in order that they might go across and take their places in the firing line where duty called them first and foremost.

The women of Russia fought against the Austrians and went over the top many a time and feared neither gas, bayonet or shell, but very few came

back. They died for their country as many of our boys have gone over and died, and I say, Mr. Speaker, that when we give to the women the right of franchise we are making a step in the right direction and we are only giving to them the right that is due them. We are making a step in the right direction inasmuch as we will have cleaner politics; our women will not tolerate the tactics that are generally used in political wars in this country. I give this petition my heartiest support, Mr. Speaker, and pray that the Government will give it due consideration.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Speakere, I am in accord with the support given this petition by my Hon. friend the Member for Bay de Verde, and my friend the Hon. Member for Burgeo and LaPoile. I have not the military experience of the Hon. Sergt. Major LeGrow, much as I desired it, nor have I the experience of the Hon. Lieut. Small, much as I might enjoy it; but I am equally sincere in offering my heartiest support to the prayer of this petition. I have heard many arguments against women as politicians, but the chief one seems to be that the mentality of a woman is inferior to that of man, but it would be an insult to our intelligence if we were to give any consideration to any such argument. Their war work effort has been unquestionable and on general principles Newfoundland should concede to her women the right of franchise that has been conceded to the women of England, Australia, New Zealand and Canada. Their record in the war speaks for itself and no words of mine can paint their sacrifices as they have been made. As Sergt. Major LeGrow has said, they went out and fought for this women and for every death that they died on the battlefield the woman at home suffers that death a thousand times over. When we consider the grief and sorrow that was theirs when they let their sons and brothers and husbands go far away over the ocean to fight on a foreign soil we can realize perhaps the cross they had to bear all through the great war. For every single death that has been recorded on the battlefield, the woman at home suffers that death a thousand ttimes over, and that's altogether apart from their services at home to which my hon. friends referred. I strongly endorse this petition and whether parliamentary or municipal, I am sure that our politics will be made cleaner. In that respect I am absolutely sincere. Our political morals are very low and our standard of political morality is very low and I am certain that the entrance of our women into politics would elevate that standard. Apart from that there are some phases of our public problems which women alone are capable of handling. We are absolutely ignorant of some of these things. I look forward to the day when the women of Newfoundland will have the right to vote. We have people who because nature has been sufficiently kind to create them men they are given the right to vote. The only qualification that they have to offer for this right is that they are men, but as regards their intellectual powers and their relative knowledge of the country's affairs they are absolutely impotent. I know men that nature never intended that they should have the right of franchise and who are allowed to vote, yet there are today in this country highly intelligent women and not granted that right.

England granted them a franchise after a long period of waiting. New Zealand did not require much inducement to do so, and Australia, a nation in the forefront of the world, willingly and voluntarily, granted them a franchise. Canada saw the necessity of giving her women a vote, and we are the only section of the Empire that has not acceded this courtesy and positive right. Looking at it from the viewpoint

of the position that women have in our life we can admit and we must admit that the one great influence in this world is the guiding influence of good women. If in our private life we appreciate that influence, why should we debar it from our public life. I have great pleasure in supporting the prayer of this petition so ably presented and seconded by the two gallant members on the other side of the House.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Speaker, I am requested to say a few words in reference to the petition before the House this afternoon, and I fear that my Hon. friend Mr. Fox won't have long to complain on that point. The principle of the petition is one that I commend to the House. I have no doubt that the right of municipal franchise is one alone that is sound, and from the manner in which it was supported this afternoon, I feel certain that any bill introduced will be endorsed in that respect. I think that in the light of the character of the petititon itself and of those who have signed, and bearing in mind the different aspects suggested it must of necessity receive the very best consideration and warmest sympathy from every member of this House. If you want to get a keen mind not obscured by little prejudice you will find that in an educated woman. Her judgment is far keener than that of a man's. We are not unmindful of the part that our women have played in the war, and I hope that in the municipal bill which is shortly to be placed before the House that one of the first sections will provide for the franchise of women.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this petition before the House, and I fully concur with the sentiments expressed by the speakers who preceded me. As one representing the city of St. John's on the city board, I think that the time has come for the ladies to do better work than the gentlemen on the board, and I can assure you that when this bill comes before the House that I will cast my vote to give the ladies the right to vote. When I was asked to say a few words on this matter this evening, all I feared was that what I would say would hamper the movement, because of the scarcity of hair on my head, but I can assure you that the scarcity of hair is not due to ladies like Mrs. Pankhurst.

As has been already pointed out, I think that in view of the noble work done by the women of Newfoundland during this war that they ought to be given the right to vote. Now the speakers who preceded me have gone over all the ground and it leaves me no ground to cover, but I can assure you that I will do all that is in my power to help give the ladies the right to vote, both in the municipal and parliamentary elections.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition from the women of the country, presented by Serget. Major LeGrow, Lt. Small, Mr. Higgins and Mr. Fox. I support this petition because I believe that the women of Newfoundland are entitled to have a vote, if for no other reason than because of the services they have rendered the British Empire during the last five years. Sergt.-Major LeGrow and Lieut. Small have told us of the great work done by the women at the front, and I am convinced that everybody in this House and outside it, realizes the work that they did in that noble institution, known as the Red Cross. They took a noble part in the war. They went to the British Empire from all parts of the world, from Newfoundland, Canada, and New Zealand, and took just as important a part as the soldiers at the front. We may take the ladies of the city and we know that if there is anything to be done in the way of good work, you will find them in the front ranks. Then take the

Women's Patriotic Association. No better institution was ever created. In that institution you could find women from eighty-four years of age down to twelve years old girls knitting socks, making shirts and doing all the other things necessary for the soldiers. Then we take the work that the women have done with regard to tuberculosis and only those who have suffered from that dread disease, can fully realize what an immense amount of good the women have done in this connection. Now take the children's welfare. What better nobler work could be done than that? Now if the women are not entitled to a vote in this country, it is a strange thing to me. I understand the British government have given them the right to vote, but I believe that it applies only to women of thirty years of age, and over and a great many women don't take advantage of it, because they don't want to tell their age, but I am sure we are prepared to give them the right to vote from the age of twenty one years up, just the same as the men. They are just as much entitled to it, because they have just as much intelligence as the men of the country. Go down to Water Street and you will find them taking their place at the typewriters, you will find them behind counters, you will find them acting as secretaries to some of the greatest men and if they are not entitled to vote, that they are not entitled to these positions.

Take as an example the people of England during the war. they were doing the men's work, farming, driving, buses, and doing everything that was necessary in the absence of the men, and the government were not slow in appealing to them to step into the breach, and they were always ready when called upon.

I trust that the Hon. the Prime Minister will bring a bill into this House to amend the election act, and give all the women of Newfoundland over twenty one years the right to vote, and I will heartily support that bill and I feel sure that every member of this House if he considers it for twenty-four hours, will not hesitate to vote, that the women, have the right to be represented in parliament, and the right to vote in elections. I believe that if they are given the right to vote, that it will mean that we will have a much cleaner election in this city, and I want to say again that I will give this bill my hearty support when it is brought in by the Hon. the Prime Minister.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the bill entitled "An Act respecting the Certificates of Masters and Mates" was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time to-morrow.

Mr. Sullivan asked the Hon. Minister of Marine and fisheries if it is the intention of the government to make provision in the estimates for the erection of a fog alarm at Pt. La Hayse, St. Mary's Bay, and for one other alarm on the western shore of Placentia Bay.

Mr. MacDonnell asked the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House a statement showing:

(a) What sums of money have been expended by his department in the District of St. George's, since November, 1919.

(b) To whom such sums were sent, and on whose advice such allocations, if any, were made.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, in replying to the question from Mr. Sullivan, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I beg to say that that information will be tabled on to-morrow, and the same reply will be given to the question from Mr. MacDonnell.

HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the

question from Mr. MacDonnell, I beg to table the information asked for.

Mr. MacDonnell asked the Minister of Justice to lay on the table of the House copies of all correspondence relative to the appointment of a commission to enquire into the circumstances and alleged malpractices as disclosed by the Woodford affidavit:

(1) Between the Department of Justice and the Governor.
(2) Between the Department of Justice and those appointed to that commission now abortive.
(3) Between the said commissioners and His Excellency the Governor.

Also a copy of the said commission.

And further, any other correspondence between his department and any other parties whatsoever on this matter.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—In reply of the question from Mr. MacDonnell, I beg to state that there has been no correspondence between the Department of Justice and the Governor, nor between the Department of Justice and those appointed to that commission, nor is there any correspondence between the Governor and those appointed to that commission in my possession. There is no copy of that commission, because the commission was never finalized. No commission was sent out signed, and no commission was issued, because the final draft to be signed by the Governor had in it instruction to the commission to report findings, and as the commission would not do that there was no use in going on with the commission.

MR. MacDONNELL:—I understood from you the other day that the commission had been appointed and would get to work within a week from then.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I did not say that. I said the commission had been drafted.

HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table a reply to a question asked by Sir Michael Cashin.

MR. MacDONNELL:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to call attention to the fact that the latter part of the question that I asked relative to the Woodford affidavit has not been answered.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—There is no correspondence whatever.

Second reading of the Council's amendments to the Public Works Bill.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, as explained yesterday this amendment is to cut out sections three and four and substitute the following therefor: The effect of it is to have Mr. James Harris styled deputy instead of secretary in harmony with the other departments of the civil service. Sections five and twenty-five are hereby amended by striking out the work secretary and substituting deputy head of the department.

Second reading of Council's amendments to the Posts and Telegraphs Bill.

Committee of the whole on Bill entitled "Of Stipendiary Magistrates and Justices of the Peace."

Committee of the Whole on Bill "Of Death Duties."

Committee of the whole on bill entitled "An Act concerning the Registry of Midwives."

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the amendments made by the Legislative Council in and upon the bills sent up entitled "An Act respecting the Department of Public Works" were read a second time and concurred in, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting them that the House had concurred in the said amendments.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the amendments made by the Legislative Council in and upon the bill sent up entitled "An Act respecting the Department of

Posts and Telegraphs," were read and concurred in, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting them that the House had concurred in the said amendments.

It is to be understood that this concurrence is not to be taken as a precedent or as an acknowledgement that the Legislative Council has the right to amend any money bill.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 4 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (third series) entitled 'Of Legislative Disabilities and the Vacation of Seats in the House of Assembly,'" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that 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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice the bill entitled "An Act to provide for the Lighting of Streets in the Outports," 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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the bill entitled "An Act for the Confirment of a Contract with the Susu Shipping Company, 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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider the bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 86 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (third series) entitled 'Of Stipendiary Magistrates and Justices of the Peace.'"

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Scammell took the chair of committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The chairman from the committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the bill without amendment.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider the bill entitled "An Act to amend Cap. 27 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (third series) entitled 'Of Death Duties.'"

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Scammell 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 amendment.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider the bill entitled "An Act concerning the Registry of Midwives."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Scammell took the chair of committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The chairman from the committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the bill without amendment.

On motion this report was received

and adopted and it was ordered that the said bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 157 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (third series) entitled 'Of the Fire Control;'" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole House on to-morrow.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, I now move that this bill be read a second time. I merely observe that on yesterday in the committee stage the House passed the subject-matter of this bill in the form of resolution. The bill simply consists of an increase for certain fire control services from $4,000 to $6,500.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider certain resolutions respecting the encouragement of agriculture.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I note that there is a printer's error in the order paper with reference to the agricultural resolutions. On yesterday this order was deferred until to-day. I move that the House resolve itself into committee of the whole to consider these resolutions.

MR. HIGGINS:—I would like to ask the leader of the government if he would give us some indication of the plan in regard to this change from twenty thousand to thirty thousand dollars. Under the old act no expenditure was ever made, although twenty thousand dollars were voted for the encouragement of agriculture.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Prior to the year 1916 there were two grants of $20,000 each, and that combined vote of $40,000 was put at the disposal of the Department of Agriculture and Mines. Shortly after the outbreak of the war the expenditure was reduced from $40,000 to $20,000 annually. The act, however, was not amended. Under these resolutions the first payment of $20,000 is increased to $30,000, and the second payment of $20,000 is increased to $25,000.

MR. HIGGINS:—That is exclusive of the Model Farm Act.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—These two votes are not exclusive of the Model Farm Act. They are under the Model Farm Act. That is the act with which we are now dealing. Under that act there was legislative authority for two grants each of $20,000, making a total of $40,000. This sum was taken by the board of agriculture and for the most part squandered. Certainly some value was secured, but a value not exceeding $20,000. A very large number of agricultural animals were imported into this country, but few were registered stock. A large number of them were of the poorest grade scrubs. They were distributed around the country with the same courteous charity that one gives Christmas presents. This agricultural policy was not dealt with as a business proposition. The distribution of animals was in the nature of political patronage and gifts rather than as a practical effort to improve stock. In many cases the animals were lost, died, or reached the butcher's table. The records show that a considerable number were "lost in bogs"; some few were reported as having gone mad and were consequently killed, and generally the policy was an utter failure. This was not due to any inherent defect in the policy as laid out by Sir Edward Morris. The policy was excellent; but it was due to the utterly inefficient administration of the policy by those to whom its admin-

istration was entrusted by the government.

MR. BENNETT:—This is in addition to the sum expended by the board of commissioners.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Under the first section providing for money grant, $20,000 was increased to $30,000, making it an annual increase under that section to the amount of $10,000. The second section relates to annual grant, and $20,000 is increased to $25,000, making an annual increase of $5,000 under that section. This makes a total increase on amount already voted by statute of $15,000. In other words $40,000 was formerly voted. We now ask for $50,000, and I feel sure that all the members of this legislature who have any knowledge of agriculture will agree with me that that is asking very little.

MR. MacDONNELL:—In reference to the statement of the Prime Minister as explanatory of this bill (of the encouragement of agriculture) or resolutions, I may say that while I agree with them and perhaps at one time had the same ideas as the Minister of Agriculture now holds, I do not think all the stock were exactly given as Christmas gifts but I hope to see an improvement in the present system which up to now has been lacking. While I agree that the animals were scattered broadcast throughout the country I do not see how much further we are getting by cutting down the animals I do not think these resolutions which will subsequently be embodied in an act to be progressive at all. They began at the wrong end. It may be very desirable that we should improve our stock of cattle in the country but if that means we have to import feed for them I fail to see that we are getting much further ahead. I suggested here some time ago when the bill concerning bounty for shipbuilding was before the House that the Government should include in its agricultural policy a provision for a bounty for the clearing of land. I have been assured that the bounty system in the past has not been a success in some places. That might be true. But with regard to our district, St. George's, I know it was a success and know that land that was cleared to get the bounty is still under cultivation and I know the amount of land under cultivation could to-day be increased three-fold if the bounty were placed again on the statute books. I believe that the government should do something in this way and give some encouragement to the people of this section of the country. The question of bounty and the matter of bonus on the crops for the first five years is a matter which I will support and I think this year when we can find enough money to pay fifteen thousand dollars to five individuals of the country who were not entitled to it unless because of the passing of an act, it is very strange that not a single dollar can be found for the encouragement of farming. There is no consistency in the policy of the government. If it means we got to raise the money we ought to raise it. This should be part of the policy of the government so that the people may be able to obtain a loan from the government for a number of years to be paid back say in five at a reasonable rate of interest on security of the properity. That is the policy that has been adopted elsewhere and it has worked out well. I think we should touch on this matter right away and something should be done immediately for the encouragement of the clearing of land and there reduce the high cost of living so much talked about. We should have increased production and thereby reduce the prices of the food stuffs. It is very regrettable that not a single dollar can be found for this very vital purpose. Still

in the face of this we bring in an act to check profiteering.

It can't be that no money can be found for this purpose. It can't be that the House believes that there is no need of increased production. There is every reason to believe that giving a bonus will greatly effect the high cost of living. Surely it is not because the suggestion has come from this side of the House that nothing is being done. I would heartily support such a measure and I hope that it will be brought in. My only regret is that we are putting the cart before the horse. We are bringing in a measure to improve our stock and to increase our stock, without making any effort whatever to increase the production to maintain the cattle. I ask and very strongly urge that this matter be considered.

MR. BENNETT:—Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the arguments put forth by the hon. member for St. George's. In reference to the bounty on land the Prime Minister made reference last night to what happened to the bounty in St. John's West. I am willing to admit that the bounty was not always handled as it should be. But that is no argument against the principle involved. The fact that a law is abused is no argument against the law, but rather against the administration of the law. The arguments put forth by the member for St. George's must impress themselves upon every member of this House . It may not apply especially to St. John's West, but there are tracks of land in the country that could very well be cultivated, and encouragement should be given. The time has come when this law should again be put into force in order to secure greater production. There is nothing that will offset the high cost of living as will increased production. I hope the government will take the suggestion. I believe it will be a popular measure. Every dollar will come back tenfold. It has always been a popular measure. With an effective administration no land would be given bonuses until first inspected and passed as fit for agricultural purposes. Once the land is inspected and passed and put under cultivation the bonus would be forthcoming. In the district of St. George's there are numerous stretches of land that could be cultivated, and made to produce much that is to-day imported, but in many cases the land cannot be reached. There are no roads to the land. In many places the grass grows higher than the height of a man, but it must be let rot because it cannot be reached. It is up to the government to see that this condition does not continue, but this valuable land is reached and put under cultivation.

I am not sure that I know what the bill before us means as far as an increased grant is concerned. Three years ago the amount voted for this purpose was $20,000. Now we are asked to raise that amount to $55,000, to be devoted as the Prime Minister outlined last night. Considering his lack of knowledge and experience in that particular direction, the Prime Minister made an admirable showing. I am of opinion, however, that our agricultural possibilities in this country are not very far reaching in certain sections. The country cannot at present be maintained to any great degree on its agricultural products except our potato crop. This bill merely means the improvement of stock and matters of that nature, and we are faced with the fact that the ministers in charge of the department cannot represent his department in this House. My mind goes back to 1913 when the Minister of Agriculture and Mines and the Minister of Justice were not present in this House. The Minister of Justice was the present Prime Minister and the Minister of Agriculture and Mines was my friend, Mr. Blandford,

the present High Sheriff. I recall the incessant bombardment from this side of the House. I remember the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Dr. Lloyd and all the members of the F. P.U. party protesting strongly against the action of the Morris government. I don't think I ever saw a man fight with greater earnestness and effect than did the Prime Minister (Lord Morris) at that time. They never let up during the session because of the absence of two responsible ministers from the House. Had not the Prime Minister been the strong resourceful man that he was thingh may have been much more serious than they were. It kept up until the gentlemen on the other side of the House saw it was useless to keep it up longer. I appeal to my friend, Mr. Jennings, if this is not true. I have no desire to hamper any agricultural ambitions of the government but I would like to know why the $20,000 is being raised to $55,000. I doubt if what the Prime Minister has said about there being no good stock in the country is true. If you will go to Mr. Geo. Ruby's farm or the Christian Brothers farm and many other such farms in the vicinity of St. John's you will find as good stock as can be seen in any country. What I do know, and what my friend Mr. Walsh will be in a position to tell the House, is that great strides were made in agricultural development during the Morris administration. Great improvements were made and these improvements have been noticeable all over the country. I don't think that the Hon. Prime Minister was well advised in making the statement last night that the monies spent during the past four or five years for this purpose were spent frivolously. I admit that some amounts that were expended were not fruitful of results but it must be remembered that $20,000 is a small amount and if it is to be increased to $55,000 much better things should be expected and the gentleman who is at present the incumbent of that department, who has so extensively advertised himself, has placed himself in the position where much is to be expected from him. He has placed himself before the public as an agricultural expert and he must now produce the goods. He has spent considerable money already in the publishing of reports and pamphlets and in newspaper publicity. This is a time for the serious consideration of our agricultural problems and not for frivolities. It is no time for men to go around the country talking of such things as cheese factories. I think we could consider ourselves well off if we could anticipate the erection of a butter factory. In my opinion the present Minister of Agriculture has a great deal to learn and I question very much if he has very much to teach the agriculturists of this country who have spent their whole life time working the soil and who know from that experience just what they have to contend with; they know what is best to suit their particular needs and the Minister of Agriculture would do well to go slowly and it is likely that he will learn something from these experienced farmers as to the conditions of the climate in this country, the conditions of the soil and many other items of general information as to the rearing of crops.

A model farm was tried here during the regime of Sir Robert Bond and while I have no doubt that this farm was well found and well fitted in every particular, and while it was conducted for a number of years along excellent lines, it was found to be of no general benefit to the country and for that reason a useless expenditure of public monies. When Sir Edward Morris came into power in 1919 it was abolished, it being pointed out that we could not hope to maintain a model farm in

this country that would be productive of as beneficial results as similar farms in the agriculture centres of such countries as Canada, for as I have already remarked, this was recognized as being no means an highly agricultural country. Moreover we had the adventure of having the model farm of Canada at our disposal and in Truro, N.S. there is one of the finest of these farms to be found anywhere in that dominion, so that we are in the position of having the most excellent model farms that could be desired, right next door, and of which we could take advantage with practically not the cost of a cent to the country. I remember some years ago, Mr. Harry Cowan and Mr. John Holden of Topsail Road, and others, went to Nova Scotia for the purpose of visiting this farm that I have referred to with the object of getting information that would be of value to them in their farming, and they came back imbued with many new ideas that were of inestimable value. We know ,of course, that $55,000 is not as much in real value as it was a few years ago, but nevertheless we shall expect to see some appreciable returns for it in the way of improvements.

I think the Prime Minister was astray in his reference to Bowcock's farm. I happen to know that property. very well. A part of it is now occupied by the Tuberculosis Sanitarium, and another portion of it adjoins the Lunatic Asylum. It was the intention of the late government to erect the new Poor Asylum on this property also. If that had been done all three of these institutions could have been administered by the one head and the available ground there could have been worked, to some extent, by the patients of the institutions who were able to do light work in the raising of vegetables, etc., and so help to make these institutions to some extent self-supporting. But sir, part of this land is bog and is considered of little value. This money should not be spent in a harem scarem manner but should be directed in channels where it is calculated to do the most good. I suppose it is the intention to put up stables for the housing of stock where they can be kept for breeding purposes, etc., and subsequently sent to the outports. These building would cost a gread deal. I do not know whether this amount includes provision for construction of such buildings. The Prime Minister has not told us that, but if so there will be very little left for anything else. The cost of building now is now exceptionally high and nothing that would be required for such a purpose could be put up for less than $15,000 to $25,000.

I repeat that I have no desire to hamper the government in any way in connection with agricultural improvements, but rather am I prepared to help them to carry out any policy of the kind, because our future food supply largely depends on our Island being literally swept by the United States of its produce, and Newfoundland can hardly get a barrel of potatoes there. There are schooners leaving P.E.I. every day laden with farm produce for American ports. Now sir, I have it on the highest authority that we should not be depending on Prince Edward Island or any place else for our potato supply. Dr. McPhail, a noted agricultural expert who was down here some years ago said to me on one occasion, when he and I walked out towards the country, "You have one of the finest potato producing countries in the world, you have all the advantages of fertilization in your peat and fish manures, and instead of importing potatoes from us you should be exporting them yourselves." It is now more necessary than ever that we raise all the food stuffs possible because

this is one of the most potent means wherewith we can fight the terrible burdens under which we are struggling to-day.

I would again emphasise the soundness of the plea so ably made by the hon. member for St. George's that a bounty be given for the encouragement of the clearing of land, and furthermore, that the bounty be made a reasonable one and one that would pay men to devote their time to this very necessary work of development, but first of all you should make sure of the nature and the productive qualities of the land to be cleared.

I therefore hope that hte passing of these resolutions shall prove to be the first step along the road of agricultural improvement, and I assure the Prime Minister that there will be found no more enthusiastic supporter than myself for any measure that has for its object the betterment of the agricultural conditions of this country.

MR. WALSH:—In regard to the resolutions now before the chair I might say that I don't presume to be an apologist for the Department of Agricudture and Mines during the period referred to last night by the hon. the leader of the government and I don't intend to listen to an attack made upon me during my time as Minister of Agriculture and Mines when the Prime Minister himself was then a party to all that was done. It is quite true that though I spent a short period in that position I do not profess to know as much about agriculture as Dr. Campbell knows about mines. I understand that this is a direct insult to all of the men who had anything to do with that department. It is also a direct insult to Mr. Halfyard who was minister of that department. With regard to his asdom of changes being made in that policy I am open to conviction but this is not the way to make improvements, nor is it right for the leader of the government to come in here like he did last night and make such contemptible references regarding the statement. With regard to his assertion that there is no pedigree cattle in this country I am not in accord. During my travelling I have seen some of the finest cattle in the world and in Newfoundland to-day I have seen cattle that is as good as any of those. Hon. gentlemen you must admit that a great deal was accomplished by the agricultural policy of the Morris Government and I think a great deal could be done now by the Prime Minister if he would come in here and do some good so as our planters may be able to get seeds this year to plant their crops.

It may be all very well to come in here and talk about model farms and encouraging horse racing but don't overlook the fact that the potato situation to-day if not taken in hand will play a far more important part in the agricultural future of the colony than these things. I say right here this afternoon that there are hundreds of farmers in the country at the present time without a barrel of seed potatoes to put in the ground to provide for the coming season. I know that such is the case in the district of Placentia and St. Mary's and so with many of the other districts. I have to-day thirty or forty letters from my constituents asking me if it is possible to secure seed potatoes. The Department of Agriculture and Mines state that they have none to give but can supply them at cost, but it is not possible for these men to obtain them even at cost and I think some means should be devised whereby they may be assisted. I resent any attempt in having potatoes sent out through the poor commissioners, but why not loan them a few barrels and have them returned when their crop is grown. It could easily be done through all the agricultural societies in the island. Some attempt should be

made to avoid the unnecessary hardships and sacrifices that the farmers and planters will be called upon to bear if left without seed. In regard to the land clearing it is quite true that something should be done and some system inaugurated although a system was brought in during the past, at the time the Thorburn government was in power some people made claims for land I think, and it didn't work because they didn't clear it. But conditions to-day are not the same as they existed then. I think that the suggestion by my hon. friend Mr. MacDonnell was a very wise one. Why not give a bounty on the crop? The fisherman farmer is very anxious to-day in regard to what is going to be done to assist him at this time. The Department of Agriculture has never had sufficient power to look after the agricultural interests of the country. We should try and encourage in every way any grants that may be proposed for the benefit of agriculture. This is the only way that agriculture will ever appeal to the masses of the people in this country. A small amount of money would provide all farmers to-day with seed who are in want of it. Ten thousand dollars would probably be sufficient to relieve the shortage. Don't you think it would be better to spend $10,000 for this purpose than to squander $50,000 on a model farm. We are now passing through a period when we must be sure that we get 100 per cent returns for the money we expend before we allow any minister to put his hand to a cheque fo rany amount. This is an important matter which I commend to the hon. gentlemen of the government and I trust that the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries will intercede and see that these people get sufficient encouragement for agriculture so that they won't be in the situation next autumn that is now predicted. Potatoes to-day are $14.00 per barrel and the whole stock of P.E.I's are being sold in the United States at a great profit.

I think that this suggestion should commend itself to the hon. gentlemen, who are associated with the government and as I said before, even now it is not too late, to have some kind of an arrangement made, whereby those conditions would be relieved. As I said before, I would oppose any attempt that may be made by the government to have these people supplied through the poor commissioner. There should be no desire, or no intention of having our people placed in the awkward position of being pauperized, and I would strongly oppose any such attempt, and I believe every member in this House feels the same way as I do, because people may be in need of help at the present time does not say that they are paupers. The government should appoint men from the agricultural department as commissioners and send them to the various sections of the country. They can then consult with the clergymen and others in the different sections of the country, who will give them reliable information and then they may come back, and see that the state of affairs, which I am afraid will come to pass, be prevented.

With regard to the inauguration of a model farm, I don't know that I would oppose that movement, but as I said before, at the present time we can ill afford to spend any great amount of money, on any experiment. I think that if the method in vogue, under the Morris government, the Lloyd government, the Cashin government, with some alterations, be carried on by the present government, will be of as much benefit to the country, as the measure up before the House.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Mr. Chairman, while the House is in committee on this bill, I would like to say a few words regarding it, not from a spirit

of opposition, because in a sense, I am in favor of it. The only thing is, that it does not go far enough. If we are going to be called upon to increase this grant to thirty-five thousand dollars, I hope it will be spent, and controlled better than the money, for similar purposes, has been because if we are to believe the report that has been tabled here, it is not the result we would expect for the money that has been spent, throughout the country, by the department of agriculture, in the past ten years. I see that on bulls alone, we have spent ,in all thirty-three thousand ,six hundred and sixty-five dollars, and eighty-one cents, on rams we have spent seventeen thousand, eight hundred and eighty-five dollars and forty cents; on pigs, ten thousand, eight hundred and thirty-six dollars and fifty-five cents, in all, sir, we have spent, sixty-two thousand, three hundred and eighty-seven dollars and seventy-six cents. On studying this report and the amount that has been spent on bulls, I should not think it has been profitable. The total number of bulls supplied to the country was three hundred and seventy-one. Out of that number, I find that there were only twenty-nine with a pedigree. In getting stock, we should be sure that they are pedigree stock, and there seems to have been no way of looking after the stock. Included in the statement submitted by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines I see that out of the three hundred and seventy-one bulls, that sixty-three have been bogged or strayed away, forty-eight killed and six have been returned to the Department of Agriculture. Out of the three hundred and seventy-one supplied one hundred are missing, and cannot be relied on. Out of the number supplied there are fifty-nine now on active service. I am sorry that I have not a full account of the rams but anyhow the rams cost seventeen thousand, eight hundred and eighty-five dollars and forty cents. If these figures are correct, it has been a very poor investment of the government. I am not opposed to granting another thirty-five thousand dollars, if they can get good stock into the country, but the stock must be better controlled and looked after than they have been in the past, and we must insist on getting pedigree stock or it is throwing away the money. I do not claim to be a farmer, but I do claim to have a certain amount of common sense. I think that at the present time it would be better for the Department of Agriculture and Mines to pass some legislation re a bounty to give encouragement to the farmers of the country to grow crops of hay, turnips and potatoes. I believe we could grow good crops in this country if we would only give the farmers encouragement to go in for it. I would like to see the government take some such action. I hope that the government will see its way clear to bring in some measure, if not this session, then next session, whereby a bounty will be provided for the growing of these crops. It would go a long way towards reducing the high cost of living, in this country. It is regrettable that the people have to pay fourteen dollars and fifty cents for a barrel of seed. This makes it very hard on the poor people of the outports to get the necessary amount of seed, to plant sufficient potatoes for their own requirements. I am glad to see that a certain quantity of potatoes have been imported and are being sold by the agricultural department for $14.50 a barrel and I want to congratulate the hon. minister of that department on that action, but I believe sir, that they are a lot short of requirements.

Seed is another very important article. If this matter is taken up on scientific lines, they will do the right thing in getting the best seed, because if we have good seed, we will get bet-

ter results from the crops, and I trust the predictions of the Minister of Agriculture will be realised. I hope the government will see their wa yclear to grant a bonus for clearing land. This custom was in vogue in this country before, and was not successful, but it can be tried again, and if they cannot provide a bonus, perhaps they can give a bounty on potatoes, hay and turnips in the country. This would be a step in the right direction and I believe that that bounty would repay us tenfold and would give better results than a bonus for clearing land.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Mr. Chairman, while the House is in committee, I would like to say a few words on this matter. I will not delay you long. I was certainly amused at the speech made by the leader of the government regarding the policy of agriculture. We were all hoping for great things from this source, according to the promises he made to the electors of the country. I was also amused when he abused the late government in that connection. The country knows, I know, and every member of this House knows, altho he seems to have forgotten it himself, that he was a member of that government and yet he comes in here and casts slurs at that government. His speech was very short. He did not outline any policy. He did not say what he intends doing in connection with this matter. He said with regard to the late government that the cattle imported in the last five or six years were simply sent out to the people of the country to do what they liked with, and they were not looked after. He has not said what he intends to do instead of sending out cattle to the country. I would like the hon. gentleman to tell us here before this bill passes how he is going to regulate it. He has not told us what amount of cattle has been imported from Canada and the United States within the last twelve months. He has not told us how he is going to place that cattle around the island.

If you are going to send those cattle around the island, as was done in the past, although you berated the late government for doing so, I fail to see how they can be under the supervision of the Agriculture and Mines Department. Every head of cattle imported here will be sent out from the department to the northern and western districts and to the extreme end of the island and how in the name of common sense will they be under the constant supervision of the department. If you have not the confidence of somebody to look after those cattle you cannot supervise them; and you cannot engage officials to go around this island and afford to pay them out of the amount you are asking this House to vote now. You ought to get in touch with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and see what he did before putting his program into being. While the Prime Minister was speaking on this bill and I was thinking, I picked up his manifesto and it struck me that I should read it to the House and to try and point out to the House after reading this way the Prime Minister offered his criticisms of the government in the past and tells of the amount of good he intends to do with the small increased vote that he is asking for here now.

Is this the agricultural policy, as outlined by the Hon. Prime Minister yesterday that we are to look forward to. The gentleman who wrote that paragraph is now the Prime Minister as well as the Acting Minister of Agriculture and Mines in this House this afternoon. When he put that before the country I presume people must have taken it seriously but I want to draw their attention to that paragraph of the leader of the government of the day and I want him to follow me when

I tell what the hon. gentleman intends to do to carry out that same policy which he denounced in the past in all its moods and tenses. The phrase ology is there in the manifesto. It is all his own. He proposed at that time to put an etensive policy before the country. Here we are to-day asked to vote $15,000 more to carry out that grand policy that was outlined to this country. I wonder if he was serious when he told the people of the country that he intended to do this because he was a member of the government when that vote for agriculture was $40,000 and he knew the reason why it was brought down to $20,000. It was reduced in order to help to pay the intering $15,000 now to what the grant was est on our war debt. We are only addduring the Morris administration after $20,000 had been deducted for war purposes or $5,000 less than what was originally voted by the Morris administration.

What is the position to-day in Newfoundland as far as seeds are concerned. You cannot get any seed potatoes to buy. To my mind it is in the same category as salt and coal. The farmers cannot get a barrel of seed potatoes to purchase in the city of St. John's. May be it would arouse your curiosity if I would draw your attention to what it means. If the Minister of Agriculture had five thousand barrels of potatoes to sell the people of this Colony to-day at $10 a barrel and say they got five barrels to the barrel on the five thousand. that would yield a revenue of four hundred thousand dollars; but at the present time you cannot get potatoes at the department for less than $14 or $15 a barrel, in fact, I understand you can not get any there at all. And still one got to come here and listen to trash handed out to him. I am an old member of the house now and I have been listening to this sort of thing year in and year out. The past Government was slurred this evening by the Prime Minister, who should know better because he was a member of it; but, after all, he is only trying to camouflage the promises he made the electorate of the island. Well, all I got to say in that direction is, that if all the rest of the legislation is of the same class as that you are now asking the house to pass upon, God help the future of Newfoundland. The hon. gentleman who represents the Minister of Agriculture and Mines in this house has not told us one iota of the future out of all the matter that he treated us to this afternoon. What does a model farm mean to the people of this Island. If you did build it it will go in St. John's east or west.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—In the West.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—In St. John's West there are a dozen or more better places than this Government can build there. Anyway what are you going to build it out of? Are you going to build it out of the $15,000 increased grant? And did you tell the people of this colony where you were going to build a model farm? And let me again draw your attention to the fact that in Newfoundland to-day north, south, east and west a large percentage of our people are perishing for want of potatoes, and if you had 100,000 barrels suited for this colony that would give eight barrels to the barrel, take your pencil and find out what it would mean. I think it would be equal to our codfishery. And here we are without a barrel of seed potatoes to be purchased. Fourteen dollars a barrel is asked from anyone who is lucky enough to get a barrel. Still we are asked to come in here to remodel the agricultural policy of the Government. Why the present increased grant is not sufficient money to buy a thousand barrels of potatoes.

We know you are not going to work miracles. The same old thing you are going to drift back to and worse than it was twenty years ago. Talk about giving out cattle. I think it was lucky these bulls did disappear. They were not the class of cattle adapted to this island. If the Government had to hold on to them we would have another million or a million and a half added to the public debt of this cost. I think the whole policy is a mock and a farce, or to use an Americanism, it is a cod pure and simple.

DR. JONES:—I had no intention of taking part in this debate, but it is beginning to dawn upon me that this bill represents the whole programme of the Government as regards agriculture.

If this bill for the encouragement of agriculture embodies all that the Government can do I am afraid the people of the country who expected so much are going to be grievously disappointed in the matter. The district I have the honor to represent is largely agricultural and in the past has benefited by the grants of the agricultural department as it has also suffered the short-comings of that department in the past. We would like very much better things, and as the era of mismanagement under which much money was squandered by the department was supposed to have passed, I had hoped that under the policy of the new Government great benefits would accrue to the country at large and to my district in particular. I remember the period when the bounty for the clearing of land was inaugurated and saw the benefits in many cases and the abuse of it in many other cases, and I hope the new policy embodies some scheme that can be managed properly and at the same time give satisfactory results. In our district the farmers are finding it difficult to procure seed potatoes, and in fact they are unable to get them because of the serious shortage this year, and next fall there will be a famine in potatoes at the head of the bay because of the short seed supply this spring. Dr. Campbell, who is now the head of the department of agriculture paid a visit to Hr. Main on the eve of what may be termed an abortive campaign (a term which was used yesterday I think by the Minister of Justice) evidently with the intention of contesting the district of Harbour Main when Mr. Woodford resigned his seat. Dr. Campbell visited my district on the day before Mr. Woodford's resignation and immediately got busy. During January and February a disease had been prevalent among the horses in the head of the bay, but none had died of the disease, and when Dr. Campbell came on the scene it was practically all over. He appointed a local man to look after the afflicted and a large supply of medicines was sent out to him. This man went about on horseback looking for patients but they were scarce, so he had to fill in his time by giving gratuitous advice. I asked in this House what his qualifications were for the position and to judge from the reply I believe any corner boy on the street was as well fitted. I was told he was being paid five dollars a day and his engagement was for 30 days. Unfortunately people accepted him as an official of the agricultural department and backed by the Government. Accepting him as such, a poor man of Avondale engaged him to treat a sick cow and as a result he lost both his cow, and calf, valued at two hundred dollars. He made a claim against the department of agriculture, but I believe it has not been paid, but I venture to say that if Dr. Campbell were to seek his election there next fall

very good care will be taken to placate this man and his friends. We have heard a lot about corruption in the district of Harbour Main, but the very first act of Dr. Campbell in the district is one of corruption of the worst sort. It neither benefited the horses, the people of the district or Dr. Campbell's chances as a candidate. If that is the kind of thing we are going to get from him as his own reformed agricultural policy then the country will be very badly disappointed. If the question of supplying seed potatoes was not more important than the finding of a job for a heeler than we have little to hope for from the new agricultural policy of the Government or the present head of the agricultural department.

MR. MACDONNELL:—I don't want to delay the debate, but as one who is very much interested in this matter, I would like to say a few words on it, and I want to thank Mr. Hibbs for his speech and compliment him as a man who is not afraid to pass an opinion on any matter, and one who is fair enough to support a suggestion he approves of, regardless of the fact that it came from the opposite side of the house than he himself is sitting on.

I think that this idea of abusing the past government is no good, because when the Government comes up for election in the next four, it is not the faults of the late Government that will count for or against them, it is what they have done while they were in power. I think with regard to these celebrated cattle, that have been distributed throughout the country for the last few years, that as we have been told there are only a few remaining, we ought to pass a vote of condolence to the brethren of the deceased and let the matter rest there.

I noticed one good thing in the speech of the hon. member for Fogo, and that was his reference to a suggestion from this side of the House for a bounty for the clearing and cropping of land.

The report of the Minister of Agriculture contains many promises. Well we made promises ourselves last fall on the lines of the manifesto. The report is somewhat typical of the Canadian politician who made promises to his constituents and was elected for four years, and when he went to his constituents again for re-election he promised that there was not a single promise that he made four years ago that he was not prepared to make again to-night. So that all that the report of the Minister of Agriculture foreshadows is a repetition of the promises made last fall. The report is not prolific of very much good, as there is no assurance that the promises will be fulfilled.

What we need is a scientific analysis made of the lands of the country by a man qualified to do it, and of the different kinds of fertilizer for the different kinds of lands prescribed by him. I do not see anything wrong with this method of prescription. A scientific man could easily prescribe a remedy for present conditions. The fact that bonuses in the past did not work out as well as expected is not an argument at the present time Perhaps there was not sufficient supervision then. It was not because the policy was bad, but because the machinery was badly carried out. It could be found to work much better by imposing a penalty in the regulations you would introduce so that any person who received a bounty for the clearing and cropping of land and who was found to have obtained that money under false pretences could be penalized. With this inauguration the revenue would be protected and there would be no chance of malpractice. I hope that before this session closes

that the Government will see its way clear to grant a bonus for the clearing of land and cropping after five years, otherwise the grant will be badly spent.

In granting the bounty on land clearing it could be got over by providing that the bounty would be given on the crop of the cleared land. That is an admirable suggestion because it does away with the chances of fraud which pertains so largely to the land bounty clearing system.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:— With reference to the increase, I am glad the opposition has favored the increase from twenty thousand dollars to fifty-five thousand, and I think the support is warranted if we can run the department of agriculture along these and at the same time keep the expenses within the scope of fifty-five thousand dollars. The vote was forty thousand up to the year 1914 or possibly 1915, and the reason of the reduction from forty to twenty thousand is shown in the statistics in the reports of the Department of Agriculture, and I shall show you how it came about. I will refer you to page 38. (Reads.) Thus you will see that the work being done with the forty thousand was practically cut in two. Also on page 40 I will show you the difference in connection with the distribution of lambs. (Reads.) You will thus see that the work done during those years was more than curtailed by half. On page 41 then, similar position appertains, though not to the same extent proportionately.

Reference was made to my criticism of the policy of the distribution of live stock and the importation of live stock by the late government. The policy of the late administration would have been alright had it been worked out successfully. The policy as originally inaugurated in the year 1908 was a magnificent idea. If it had been worked out properly it would have brought about substantially good results.

My criticism was that the results for the past ten years are not commensurate with the one-third of one million dollars expended during that period. The expenditure was three hundred and thirty odd thousand dollars. Any one would criticise when he cannot conceive any good results after expending such a sum.

Mr. Crosbie has pointed out that there have been good results, and that is true, but they are not commensurate with the expenditure of one third of one million dollars. We simply ask for an increase of fifteen thousand dollars over the vote for the years from 1910 to 1916. In inaugurating this policy of the Government I wish it to be understood that we are conservative in the matter, but this we deem to be sufficient to start the programme. When the budget comes down there will be an opportunity to deal with this important subject among many others. This amount is enough to reorganize the department.

Now, Mr. Bennett criticised me as being an understudy for Dr. Campbell. That is true. But it is with great pleasure I am an understudy for such a man of great ability, a real genius and with such wide experience, and I never hope to acquire a part of the rare knowledge of agriculture he has. He has accomplished the most yet in the department, as is evidenced by his work in the department during the last ten days. As to the personal criticisms thrown across to me I will not make reference. I am only here at present to discuss the merits and demerits of the bill. I wish to take this opportunity of thanking the leader of the opposition for making reference to me in a section of the hansard. In accordance with the state-

ments in my manifesto of last fall on the eve of the general election we hope to carry out the proposed agricultural program.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I would like to ask why it is only fifteen thousand.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—It was forty thousand before.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—It was cut in two in practice, but the act was not amended. In the yea" 1920-21 thirty-five thousand more will be expended than in the ear 1918-19.

MR. MACDONNELL—I would like to see the Government include in this section some provision for bounties on on land. I think it is time that this is recognised. As to the fifteen thousand increase I would like to see it one hundred and fifty thousand dollars.

Mr. Chairman, I must say that I am rather surprised, because I understood from the Hon. Dr. Campbell that a scheme was going to be found out to eliminate the evil effects of the old system for the clearing of land, but he was not inclined to advocate a bounty for the clearing of land, but he was prepared to support the policy which would give a bounty for the cropping of land within five years after it was cleared. Of course it may be very estimable in the opinion of some people to import the very best kind of cattle and have a model farm to show, but I am rather surprised, I must repeat, that there is nothing in the policy and program of the government tending towards the fostering and encouraging of land clearing and the growing of crops.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I agree with the observations of my hon. friend, the member for St. George's, and the lines along which he has spoken are identical with those of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, Dr. Campbell, and I trust along these lines we shall be able to develop some practical proposition with reasonable expense and carry out the scheme as indicated by my hon. friend. And I really believe some good will be the result of such a program. I have discussed the matter with the Minister of Agriculture and Mines and his views are similar to those of the hon. member for St. George's.

MR. HIGGINS:—I wish to compliment the Prime Minister upon the excellent manner in which he has acted the understudy for the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, and just like the lawyer-like manner he has swallowed more than the ordinary lay man could from the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, according to his thoughts of the matter all through, but I think he will agree with the principle that although it is discharged from the order paper which practically amounts to an adoption of it, it would be advisable that it stand deferred until tomorrow, when maybe the Prime Minister will be able to give us an idea as to what is to be represented by that thirty thousand dollars. He will appreciate that whatever was contemplated years ago does not appear on the bill and what is contemplated now is not apparent either. We would like to get an idea as to what is to be done with this money. I ask that the matter be embodied in resolution form and that the committee rise until to-morrow as a matter of form. There is not likely to be much debate upon the subject and then we will have an opportunity to discuss the demits and merits of the matter.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I have no objection to this item (Of the encouragement of agriculture) being deferred until to-morrow. I may say that it is not the intention of the agriculture department to develop the model farm as contemplated years ago but to inaugurate a scheme en-

tirely different in principle, and it is not to be a scientific research. I take this opportunity to say that it is the intention of the Government to utilise the Bowcock Farm, which belongs to the Government, and have it planted and grow a large crop to feed a large number of cattle next year. It is the policy to have more potatoes and other articles of food grown to meet the shortage Newfoundland is facing. It is contemplated to acquire the necessary amount of nitrate of soda and import the numbers of seeds too numerous for me to enumerate, and not being a farmer I could not do so. It is not the idea of a scientific farm. It is not the idea of the Government to import cattle for breeding purposes and send them around without any supervision. Nothing of a scientific nature belongs to the proposed proposition. The department of agriculture and mines is giving its attention to the general improvement of stock and the encouragement and development of farming. It is thought that the potatoes and turnips and cabbage and other articles are produced in greater quantity and with a finer taste than those imported into the country for human consumption for years past. This is a general outline of our plans. And between now and three o'clock tomorrow afternoon I shall receive another lesson in agricultureal tuition.

Mr. MacDonnell gave notice of question.

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave notice of introduction of bill.

HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—I beg to table the reply to the question of Sir Michael Cashin.

Mr. Speaker announced that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting him that that body had passed a bill entitled "Of the Dept. of Public Works" with some amendments. The amendments were thereupon read a first time.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—In moving that these amendments be read a second time on to-morrow, I would explain that their effect is merely to make Mr. James Harris the deputy minister of the department instead of secretary.

Hon. Mr. Speaker announced that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting him that that body had passed the Posts and Telegraphs Bill with some amendments. The amendments were thereupon read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on tomorrow.

Committee of the whole on bill entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of a Contract with the Susu Shipping Co., Ltd."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of committee.

The committee rose and reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the bill with some amendments.

Second reading of bill entitled "An Act to check Profiteering."

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Mr. Chairman, I have no intention whatever of prolonging the discussion, but would like to make a few observations on this important agricultural matter. As I look around the house, I see all classes in the community represented, but we are apparently lost for a Minister of Agriculture and lost for a farmer, and the only man in my judgment, who has disulayed any particular knowledge of the subject is the hon. member for Fogo. He evidently has some idea about it, but what surprised me is that he has branched off to something new and is now identified in the printing business. I notice in these resolution provision made for a new model farm; a vote for $55,000, which really means

an increase of $35,000 over what has been spent annually the past two years; and a proposal to introduce thoroughbred stock. Now if my experience counts for anything. I would like to say, as regards thoroughbred stock, that by the time Dr. Campbell has bought enough of thoroughbred stock he will not have enough left out of that $55,000 to build a hen house, because he will be handicapped immediately for want of funds.

I have no objection to amend or increase this vote for agriculture, but there is no doubt in my mind whatever that there is a great deal of difficulty in trying to get people to take seriously what any Government will do in this country for agriculture, outside of a few men who wholly and solely make their living out of farming. The average man who does a little farming and a little fishing does not develop any quantity worth while of either, and really, after all, he only raises enough stuff for the use of his own family.

The Hon. the Prime Minister stated that a great deal of stock, under the policy of the late government, were given out as Christmas boxes. Now I do not agree with him, although he was a member of that government. When Sir Edward Morris introduced his agricultural policy, I remember the words that he used, namely, "We want to make this non-political." That was the greatest mistake he ever made. You cannot work on that principle and here is my reason for saying so. I remember in my own district, at that time I represented the district of Bay de Verde, an agricultural board was formed and animals were sent out to the different sections to be cared for. I saw the animals and they were excellent. One man got one of the finest looking animals I ever saw in my life to take care of, but because he was politically opposed to the party then in power, he let the beast starve to make political capital out of it. Now how are you going to get beyond that.

The Morris government made a mistake by making its agricultural policy non-political, and in nine cases out of ten you will experience the same difficulty tomorrow at the hands of your opponents, if your pursue the same policy. But I do say this, that the cattle sent out and scattered over this country by the Morris government did a great deal of good, not withstanding to the contrary the statement of the Prime Minister that they reached his table and mine and the butcher shop. I would also like to say that two of the best butchers in the country told me that the cattle raised and produced by this stock were the best they ever handled. If you will take a drive tomorrow around Conception Bay to Bay Roberts, you will see more sheep and lambs there than you ever saw before the Morris government were elected to power, so you see the distribution of the live stock over the country by the late administration must have done some good. The reason why I take eception to the remarks of the Prime Minister is because he was part of that policy and was there when it was put through. The cattle that he says went out as Christmas gifts, I think went out in the spring of the year. The policy of distributing cattle would have been productive of more good if the people had interested themselves more in taking care of them.

Then again agricultural boards, no odds, are just like the road boards. They will christen their friends first. No odds who elected them, you will find that that is the way that road boards are elected at the present time. I had an exhibition of that in my own district recently where there

was a road board election at Clarke's Beach. There were only ten or twelve present, the rest of the settlement not knowing anything about it. The man who was elected chairman would not have been elected if proper public notice had been given. I appeal to the hon. minister of public works to give, at least, ten days' notice when road boards are being elected in future, and the magistrate of any place is the proper person to call a meeting. There is no necessity for the minister to get fussed up over this thing now, because I accept the opinion of the late chairman and am perfectly satisfied as to what happened. And that is where the trouble is going to come in regard to agricultural boards. When the board send a good animal to any section of this country, be sure that it will be given to a man who is able to take care of it. I am not opposed to this policy of buying pure bred stock, but I am giving you warning of what the late government suffered.

I understand that the minister of agriculture proposes to copy his model farm off Cumming's model farm in Truro. I visited there and I hope that that is not a sample of a good Canadian farm, which he has waxed eloquently of so much. You would want a couple of policemen to take care of you when you are passing through there, and you will not find ten men in Nova Scotia that will back that farm up.

I notice that the hon. member for Fogo dealt at length with the cankered potatoes. I remember the utterances of the late Mr. Dwyer in this house on the same matter. I want to tell my friends that this is a serious thing, as cankered potatoes are unfit for human consumption. I understand the Minister of Agriculture has imported out from Scotland a quantity of seed potatoes, and I say that if it takes the whole $55,000 to supply the country with seed it will be money well spent.

As to the reference of the hon. member for Fogo regarding fertilizer, I am in accord. You have not a man in this country today who can tell you what kind of ground to put fertilizer in. You want an expert to do it, and it requires a great deal of care and attention. If the hon. gentleman representing the Minister of Agriculture in this house had time, I would suggest to him to take a visit to the side of Quidi Vidi Lake and see a good example for himself of what a young man named Ross can do in the way of farming. He will show you, I am sure, just as good crops and live stock as you will see in any part of Canada, and all credit to him, and I say that Dr. Campbell ought be instructed to go down there and see Ross's farm and the class of cattle he has there reared and bred in this country. He is worthy of taking advice from.

My friend, the Hon. Mr. Hibbs, stated that he made application to the Minister of Agriculture for twenty barrels of seed potatoes to send north, but I understand that up to the present he is not in receipt of same. Now in my district there is a marked shortage of seed and some people cannot afford to pay for the amount that is procurable at such a high price. The Attorney General, who once represented the district of Port de Grave, knows that a great deal of farming is done by the people over there. I would suggest to the Government that as the people are not in a position financially now to purchase seed from the department that they be provided with seed on a. guarantee that a proportionate amount of potatoes should be returned by them to the government in the fall.

MR. SAMSON—They told us north

that you bought all the potatoes last fall.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Yes, the current price per barrel was $4.50 and I paid $6.00 and sold them for $8.00, and I would do the same to-morrow if I got the chance. I bought considerable this spring and made a handsome profit out of them. Would you blame me for that?

I suppose you'll say I bought enough to get votes, not I. But getting back to this policy. On behalf of the district I represent I strongly support what Mr. Hibbs and Mr. MacDonnell have asked, that is that the government consider this land bounty. I think it will do a great deal of good, and the suggestion of Mr. Hibbs that the owner of the land get one half of the bounty when the land is cleared and the other half when the crop is on it is a good one. If the hon. the minister of finance could find enough of funds to carry out this suggestion I think he would do a good deal. I am sure it would do credit to the prime minister if he would see that this is accomplished. I support these suggestions of Mr. Hibbs and Mr. MacDonnel and I ask the Government to take them into consideration.

But I wish to say in defense of the Government I was associated with, that if Sir Edward Morris's policy had been carried out along the lines he wished a great lot of good would have resulted, and I have no hesitation in saying this. I may tell the Government that sooner or later, no matter what plans they have had, they will find some of them they will not accomplish. But I do ask that the bounty be extended and some of those poor people be provided with seed potatoes.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the resolutions without amendment and recommended that a bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

On motion this report was received and adopted and the bill entitled "An Act to amend the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Encouragement of Agriculture'" was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of hon. the minister of marine and fisheries the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider certain resolutions regarding the export of codfish from this Colony.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of committee.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the hon. the introducer of these resolutions if he would consider these resolutions standing over until to-morrow? I understand that the trade are having a large meeting at 11 o'clock. If he wants to go on I am willing to take my part. You do not wish to let them stand over until to-morrow.

Mr. Chairman and Gentlemen,—To say that I am somewhat astonished at these resolutions would be putting it mild. I saw the resolutions first at the Board of Trade. There were 27 exporters present at the meeting, and they were unanimous that the resolutions were not what is required. I say unanimous, there was only one voted in favor of them, and I suppose he was afraid to vote otherwise. My great objections to these resolutions: 1, I am British; 2, they are not what this war was fought for; 3, they are a restriction of trade.

Last year when these resolutions first came into effect it was done, I think, under what we call the Imperial Act, which was agreed to by the gov-

ernment that I was associated with. The case was taken to the Supreme Court here and ruled out. And then the Government took advantage of an act that was never intended for that purpose, namely, the War Measures Act. The hon. minister and I differ very greatly on these resolutions. It is a pity when two great men differ. He has been abroad, and he says that everything would have been lost but for the regulations. Now I think that the loss would not have been as great if the regulations had been left out. The regulations had no effect in sustaining the market. He has the right to think as he does, and I have the right to think as I do. He was at the Board of Trade at that first meeting when these resolutions were first discussed. I was prepared to lay my cards on the table. The result is that 26 are with me now; only one against me. He was afraid and dropped out. Is this British fairplay?

I quite agree with the hon. minister that we should not be allowed to abuse the quality, but when the Government comes in and dictates to me whether I shall sell my fish for cash or on a ninety day note, whether I shall send it to Spain or Italy, they are going too far. It is not British fairplay. There is one thing that would help, give certificates for Nos. 1, 2 and 3 fish, and then let supply and demand take care of the rest.

I go down to you tomorrow and I say to you, I have 1,000 barrels of flour to sell. You say, all right, it would be a little inconvenience today for me to pay cash, I'll give you a ninety day note. Would it not be drastic for the Government to come in and say you will not take that note? Would that be right? Would that be British fairplay? We are satisfied that the men who give us a 60 or 90 day note are all right. Under this act we cannot do it. Is that what the great war was fought for? In my opinion it is not. The hon. minister said here yesterday that he may not put the regulations into effect; but if he should come along to Crosbie's store next fall and find 60,000 quintals of fish he might say we can't allow you to ship. We must wait until the other fellow gets some.

HON. MINISTER MARINE & FISHERIES—I would not have power to do that under this act.

In all probability it will be a bill that all will agree to. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to reply to a few remarks made by Sir John Crosbie before I come to the matter of rising the committee. You said, Sir John, that you are debarred from having an agent on the other side to sell your fish.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—No, I said that I wouldn't sell fish if I had to have five agents to do it for me.

HON. MINISTER MARINE & FISHERIES—If I had my way all the men would send agents abroad to sell their fish. If I had to wait for orders I would be in a very bad position. Today we have representatives of all the big flour firms here, and they are constantly going into the trade and securing orders for their firms. Now this is the same position that the trade of Newfoundland should be placed into as regard to fish. And, if the regulations become law we will be in that position. In regard to raising the committee until after the exporters meet tomorrow I have no objection, and if any good can come out of it, well, I must say that I am ready to co-operate with the trade at all times.

Now we have the opportunity and the time has come when we must change our methods and stop sending cargoes of valuable fish overseas and letting them rot in ports and get one-third of the price for it. The time has come to perfect trade conditions

in this country and every fish that we ship must be paid for. All other countries ship their goods in this manner and why shouldn't we do the same. We must wake up and find out some day that trade must be developed on sound lines and not on merely speculative lines as it is to-day.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Under this bill you'll have any power the board gives you.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I am well able to sell my own fish and always was and you know that I was cute enough, when you put your regulations into force, to get clear of what I had without going outside to do it.

HON. MINISTER MARINE & FISHERIES—Did you make any money on it?

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Indeed I did make money on it, although unfortunately the man I sold it to dropped $7,000 on it.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—I thought you never sold bad fish.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—It was not bad when I sold it.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—No, as a matter of fact I understand that fish turned out good.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Now sir, would the hon. minister like for the five gentlemen who are members of the F. P. U. go down to Port Union and dictate to him as to how he should run his business? I venture to say that he would not stand for it. Why should I or you or any other man purchase fish and pay for it thru the banks or out of our own money, and then put it in our stores and leave it there because a few men who don't know a cod's head from its tail or a sculpin from a tomcod, say I must sell it. The thing you know in your innermost heart that such a proposition is not fair, if you would but admit it. While I have the power to do so, I shall stick out for British fair play, and this is not fair play of any kind.

The hon. minister spoke yesterday of supplies being curtailed and said that a day of reckoning was at hand. Well, he and I can shake on that. The day of reckoning is here and this thing is not going to help us meet it, and even the most intelligent man on Water Street admits this fact. You are going to drive capital out of the country. Suppose for argument sake that I bought 100,000 quintals of fish and sold 70,000 quintals of it, making two dollars a quintal on it, or in other words a total profit of $140,000, and then tried to get clear of the other 30,000 qtls. without a loss, would not my business instinct tell me that it was good business to do so, and would not the hon. prime minister himself say that it was good business. All I hope for his own sake is that he will not persist in bringing this bill into effect, but in any case he has stopped many people from giving out supplies because of the fear that he will bring it in. Speaking of supplies reminds me that only a few days ago I met a man who always paid his account and who I suppose does not owe a cent to anybody, and he told me that he had travelled the length of Water Street and couldn't get a barrel of flour to take home with him.

There is another phase of this situation which is a very serious one and it is this: If the buying of fish gets into the hands of five or six people or if the whole fishery trade is represented again by seven or eight merchants, we will soon afterwards revert to the days when the fishermen were going around with the yaffle under their arms looking for a buyer. I don't care what others may think,

but that is my firm opinion. I know by the hon. minister as I look over at him that he intends to drop the price in Portugal again very shortly. No matter, there are bound to be heavy losses anyway. There is another thing. I understand he will have agents in the markets the coming season to look after his own fish. Am I right, sir?

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Yes, to a certain extent.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I thought so and I crongratulate you on your foresight, but that gives you a big advantage over the rest of the trade.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Your resolutions back that up.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—These resolutions were contrary. Now if you have all arrangements made to sell your own fish———

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—Don't go too far with it.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Well, does it not amount to that. If you will have agents in the markets I suppose you have your arrangements made. Now if you can do that, why can't I do it?

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES—You can if you want to.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Yes, but you won't let ns sell our fish as we want to. Now I can imagine you if anybody tried to treat you in this way. Instead of using large black type, The Advocate would be painted red with my photograph on the top with a headline reading "Look What This Highwayman is Doing Now," "Black Ruin is Right Upon Us and All is Lost." You know this is true and there are many others on the other side of the house who know that it is true, but you won't bring your minds around to look at the thing fairly. I am not arguing from a political standpoint, I am arguing from the standpoint of British fairplay. You have got an executive that with the exception of Mr. Halfyard, don't know a sculpin from a squid.

HON. PRIME MINISTER—We are unable to identify you, Sir John.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—Yes, and this is not the only time that you've been unable to identify me. What you know about the subject now under discussion would only fill a leaf of a very small book. Of course nobody expects you to know anything about it, for the man who knows his own business knows a lot, and we have many of them going around today who don't even know that much. Now sir, I am not fighting this thing for myself: I am able to go on whether this bill passes or not, but the people who sent me here would have a very opinion of me if I did not voice a protest against such a measure I want to put it to you, is it fair? Is it British for you to keep me from selling my goods the best way I can? Have you not just as much right to go down on Water Street and say to the storekeepers you must not sell that high-priced flour or you must not sell that sugar you buy for 16 cents for 26 cents. We don't know what sort of a pitfall we are preparing for ourselves until we fall into it.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN — Mr. Chairman, I think it is only fair to accede to the request of Sir John Crosbie. The trade have a right to consider this thing, knowing that they handle something like $20,00,000 of our exports of fish, and I think it would be only right to raise this committee and hear what the country has to say to-morrow.

HON. MIN. MARINE & FISHERIES—Just a few remarks in reply to the hon. member for Port de Grave. The whole substance of this bill is to provide that if a man sends his fish across he must get cash for it with-

out having to get back to the old system of a 30 or a 60 day note. We would then be in the same position as a shipper of flour to this country. That is the very thing we want. We must get our cash before we part with our fish. But still a dealer on the other side will sell his fish and provide 60 or even 90 day accommodation if he cannot get the cash for it. These regulations do not interfere as far as that is concerned. At a meeting of the board of trade the other day one of the members offered a suggestion that we pool all the fish. That is exactly what is required and the best way to handle our fishery exports, and it is likely to come some day. But, at the present time this is not possible and the next best thing is the regulations under this bill. Out of these regulations will come some day probably an Association of Exporters. If our exports were controlled by one body all our troubles would be at an end. In the absence of such an organization, this bill is best. In the bill there is not a rule or regulation to be found. It only provides the machinery. A board will be appointed having powers to recommend to the Governor-in-Council. No Government is going to acknowledge any recommendations that would be detrimental to the good of the fishery. What good is there of having governments if they do not look after these things? I promised the exporters that before fixing the price of fish I would call a meeting of the exporters and discuss matters with them. They felt that if this were done they did not see any strong objection to the regulations. I did not intend to stand behind the resolutions of the exporters in having them only to fix the price of fish and control exports under present circumstances. I am glad to say that we have here arrived at a decision not altogether unfavorable to this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am not fixing these regulations to benefit the merchants of this country. My chief object is looking after the interests of the men who sent me here, and the merchants are saying to themselves, if Coaker can fix the prices we sell fish for in Italy, Greece and Oporto, he knows what we should pay for it and we will not get such profit on what we sell early in the season, and I am suspicious that this is the reason why there is so much opposition to the fish regulations by some exporters. I know of a man who in the months of December and January made a profit of sixty thousand dollars on three cargoes of fish that he sold. He could not do this under the regulations, because we would know the value he was to receive and would fix the price so as to allow him only a fair percentage of his profit on his outlay. And now I am going to give you some information with regard to the exportation of fish this year under the regulations. This year we sent to Italy 200,000 quintals against 210,000 last year. To Canada last year we exported 20,512 quintals and this year 38,376 quintals, an increase of 18,036 quintals. To England 6,080 last year and this year 57,549, an increase of 51,469 quintals. To the British West Indies this year we exported 70,196 quintals, against 57,852 quintals last year, an increase of 12,344 qtls. To Spain this year we sent 346,000 qtls., against 263,000 last year, an increase of 73,000 qtls. To Greece we shipped about three or four thousand qtls. less than last year. To Portugal this year we shipped 510,450 qtls., against 407,000 last year, an increase of 103,000 qtls.

This year altogether up to date we have exported 1,585,952 quintals against 1,437,336 quintals last year at

the same date. Of course we must consider that last year we had a considerable stock of old fish here that went out later. These figures do not give us much cause for uneasiness with regard to the regulations. The other day at the meeting I asked to be given proofs as to the evil worked by those regulations. I asked to be given some facts that would convince me that they were injurious. The only answer I got was that there is a little danger in the fixing of prices, because such high prices abroad may not be forthcoming in the early weeks of the season.

I have much pleasure in acceding to the request of the leader of the opposition not to proceed with this bill until the board meets to-morrow.

The chairman from the committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

On motion this report was received and it was ordered that the committee have leave to sit again on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of hon. the prime minister, the house resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider the bill entitled 'An Act to Check Profiteering.'

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Committee of the whole on bill "An Act to Check Profiteering."

HON. PRIME MINISTER — Mr. Chairman, I beg to move that the following be made Section (2). as suggested by the Hon. Mr. Higgins, senior member for St. John's East: "Upon complaint being made by any person to the board that a profit upon any article sold is unreasonable, the board shall forward cause for such investigation to be made."

MR. HIGGINS:—I would suggest that you re-number the sections from that on.

HON. PRIME MINISTER: — I would suggest that we insert the word net before profit all through the act.

MR. HIGGINS—With regard to Section (2) I would suggest the insertion of the following after the word complaint: "Notice of the time and place which such proceedings are to be held shall be given to at least two of the daily newspapers forty-eight hours before the beginning of such proceedings."

HON. PRIME MINISTER—I have no objection to that.

MR. CHEESEMAN—Before going further I would like to ask if this act only applies to foodstuffs only or does it apply to all classes of merchandise?

HON. PRIME MINISTER—It pertains to everything sold in Newfoundland but not on what is exported from Newfoundland.

MR. CHEESEMAN—Take a vessel for instance that I bought a few years ago for two thousand dollars and sold to-day for eight thousand, would that be considered as excess profit or not; or take a codtrap that I bought four or five years ago for $200 and after using it ever since I sell it to-day for twice that amount. What then?

HON. PRIME MINISTER: — The question is not what it was worth five years ago or twenty-five years ago, but what it is worth in the market to-day. A man may have bought something for a thousand dollars five years ago and get five thousand for it to-day, but that would not bring him within the scope of the act.

MR. CHEESEMAN—Well that's a question again of following the markets. Supposing I bought a barrel of flour a few months ago for $15 and kept it until now and sold it for $17. Would I be justified in charging it, under the act? It strikes me that I would not.

MR. HIGGINS:—You might and

you might not. It is a question of law.

MR. FOX:—Might I ask the hon. prime minister what his object was for inserting the word net before profits.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—This refers to a comparative profit as between to-day and pre-war times. A comparative profit to-day with a comparative gross profit of pre-war times would be exceedingly unjust. It would not be just to have the gross profit on a certain article to-day $1.00, if it was $1.00 five years ago, because the cost of the article has since doubled and trebled and the cost of the maintenance and upkeep of the premises of the business man, such as coal, rent, etc., has doubled and trebled.

MR. FOX:—I thank the hon. the prime minister for what he stated and the Section 3 which has the world 'net' inserted is not desirable. I think there may be cases in which a man can so manipulate his accounts and by taking account of certain expenses he could commit a lot of fraud. This act is after the English Act, and in the English one no reference is made to net profit, and I think the legislators on the other side will appreciate the fact that there is a danger if this word is left in that certain defences may be had owing to its inclusion in this section.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—I fully appreciate the observations of the hon. member for St. John's East in connection with the word 'net.' This act is drafted along the lines of the English act, and I have read some very active newspaper criticisms of the English act on the question as to whether the profit referred to was gross profit or net profit. However, the insertion of the word is not important, provided it is clearly understood that if the sum of $1.00 was considered to be a reasonable profit on a given sum $1.00 might not be a reasonable profit upon that same article to-day. Let me illustrate. Take a very small business concern, with a very limited capital and credit. Let us call it A. B. & Company. Let it be granted that their maximum credit and capital combined does not exceed $40,000. To-day that company cannot carry more than one-half the stock for its $40,000 that it did in pre-war days. That company has to pay overhead charges two and three times as great to-day as then. The living expenses of the owner of the business are two or three times as great now as then. I. A. B. & Co. have only one-half the quantity of goods to sell and have to pay twice as great overhead charges, and the living expenses of the owner are twice as great, the house can appreciate the fact that business would have to exist on the same profit per article as would have been a paying profit in pre-war day. This is consequently not a matter of comparison of the difference between the retail selling price as compared with the cost landed in pre-war days and the retail selling price as compared with the cost landed to-day. If the difference between the selling price and cost landed in pre-war days was reasonable, having regard to the circumstances as they then existed, then the same difference between selling price and cost landed to-day would be entirely unreasonable, having regard to conditions as they now exist.

MR. FOX:—My point is this, that a man may be charging exorbitant prices on a particular article, and to arrive at what profit he is making it is necessary to go back to what he purchased it for, not the amount of profit he made five years ago. If I am in the flour business and bought flour at ten dollars per barrel and

sold it for seventeen dollars and fifty cents per barrel, I stand to profit seven dollars and fifty cents over and above the purchase price. I might have purchased it five years ago.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—I think my honorable friend will see from a careful perusal of the last paragraph of Section 2 that the proviso merely means that a rate which does not exceed thef air average rate earned by persons in the same way of business as the seller upon the sale of similar articles under pre-war conditions shall not be deemed unreasonable; that means, unreasonably great so as to bring the seller within the scope of the operations of the act. On the other hand, the same rate of profit might under existing conditions be altogether too small, because the small business man of to-day cannot possibly support and maintain himself and his family, with living two and three times greater than it was in pre-war days and profit only the same as was then made. These small business men of the class to which I am referring, the small shopkeepers and dealers, were not a class of people who became wealthy because of the great profits made before the war. As a whole they got a comfortable living and no more as a result of marked industry and frugality. On the same margin of profit to-day such a man would starve.

On the question of the purchase and sale of flour and similar articles on a wholesale basis a serious problem arises. The question has to be considered is not so much the difference between the cost price and the selling price as the difference between th selling price and the actual market value of the article on the day it is sold. Supposing, for instance, a merchant buys one hundred barrels of flour to-day for delivery in August next. Unless the Wheat Board of Canada or some other trade organization interferes with his contract, he has to pay for that flour the price contracted for to-day. If in the meanwhile the price of wheat goes down, the Canadian seller may make a large profit of the transaction, because the Newfoundland purchaser is bound to pay his contract price. If on the other hand, the price of wheat goes up, the Newfoundland purchaser makes a considerable amount of money, because the Canadian seller cannot charge him more than the contract price.

That flour comes into St. John's. The value of that flour is not what was paid for it: it is the market value of that article, having regard to the price of wheat on the day it lands. If that flour is here in stock for three months, and at the end of the three months the price is gone up, the sale price of that flour at the end of the three months is the price to which that flour has advanced, and the man who has held the flour makes money on it. If, on te other hand, the price of flour has gone down, the value of that flour is the market value at the time of its sale, and the merchant who has held the flour has lost money on it.

Surely nobody thinks that if a man bought a schooner for $1,000 five years ago and the present value of the schooner in the market is $5,000, that man should be put in jail as a profiteer because he charged the $5,000 which is the market value of the schooner. If a man break out another's window, the damages are not what the pane of glass cost when it was put there ten years ago; the damages are what it would cost to replace that pane of glass to-day.

If a man has a schooner for sale, the question in which he is concerned is not what was the value of that schooner when the schooner was

built years ago; it is, for what could he replace the schooner to-day. The value of a barrel in a man's store is not what it cost to put that barrel ot flour in the store; it is what he could replace that barrel of flour for in the market to-day. If a man buys flour at $15.00 a barrel and flour drops $1.00, then he has to sell his flour at $14.00. No purchaser would think of paying him $15.00 merely because the seller paid $15.00 for it. The purchaser would not pay a cent more than the value of that article in the market; that is, the value at which he could get another barrel of flour to take its place.

You cannot ask a business man to invest large capital in the importation of goods and tell that merchant by Act of Parliament that if there is a drop in the market and the price goes down, then he has to use the money out of his own pocket, while if there is a rise in the market and the price goes up, he has to forfeit the profit which the increase in the market value of the article would give him. That is one of the first principles of political science. As a result of the abnormal war conditions and the world turmoil, Acts have been introduced from time to time to regulate matters of prices.

In twenty years time those of us who are then living and students of political science will be able to determine as to whether these legislative enactments have on the whole been beneficial or not. I would be a prophet to venture an opinion as to what the views of posterity will be, but the great mass of public opinion to-day is that legislation of this sort ishelpful to the consumer and constitutes a temporary bar to prevent that proportion of the mercantile class who are dishonest from having free scope for the exercise of dishonest activities. The object of this Act is to do justice to the people of Newfoundland; it is not to ask the importer of goods to take all chances on big losses and take no chances on big profits. Just so soon as any such law comes into effect in this country there will be no importers. What man is there who will trade in schooners if the law tells him that he has to stand, out of his own bank account, every large loss that he makes, but will not be permitted to have for himself any large profit he makes. You will not get anybody to do business on that basis. You will not get a merchant to import flour, beef, pork, molasses, sugar and the other staple requirements of the country's trade which involve large capital outlays if they are told by the government that they have got to take their chance on losses but take no chance on profit.

Hence the word of this section is such as to provide that the profit charged is reasonable "in view of all the circumstances" and the clear minimum is the rate which does not exceed the rate earned by persons in the same way of business as the seller upon the sale of similar articles under pre-war conditions, shall not be deemed unreasonable. Certainly that would be the natural minimum as I have already explained because the small business man cannot begin to think of running a business and supporting himself and his family on the same margin of profit as he earned in pre-war days.

MR. FOX—If profit was excessive five years ago, then it would be profiteering to-day because it was not right then.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—It is just possible that in an individual case the profit earned five years ago as an individual item might have been ecessive, and that in spite of the general increase in cost of living, and overhead charges, it might still be

excessive, but such circumstances are likely to be exceedingly rare occurrences, and no bill can be so worded as to meet every possible contingency.

MR. FOX—Might I suggest so we might have some time to consider the section that the committee rise and ask leave to sit again to-morrow.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Why certainly, the matter may stand over until to-morrow. The question as to whether the word 'Net' is or is not inserted is a matter of very little importance, because the section indicates that such profit as is reasonable "in view of all the circumstances" is the profit to be allowed, and it does not matter whether that profit is "Net Profit" or "Gross Profit."

MR. HIGGINS—I take it is not so much the words "Net Profit." It does not make any difference if the word "Net" is there or not. I take it if the word "Profit" is there only net profit is meant. If I purchase an article at one dollar and sell it at one dollar and twenty cents the profit would be twenty cents and word "Net" plays no part. I think as far as the English Act is concerned it is the outcome of the conditions after the war, and the only idea anticipated here in this Bill is to endeavour to have the right competition. In normal time competition forced prices to be fair and reasonable, and as the Prime Minister stated in England there was not enough of competition. I think we can improve this section a bit (Sec. 3).

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—This matter has been the subject of some newspaper controversy in England. I am quite satisfied that it may be left to the Board to work out in a reasonable and just manner.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS—I would like to have this deferred until to-morrow (Business Profits Tax Act). Gives notice of introduction of Bill.

Mr. Walsh gives notice of question.

Dr. Jones gives notice of question.

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 to-morrow.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the Bill entitled "An Act to amend "The Income War Tax Act" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole House on to-morrow.

Hon. the Minister of Finance & Customs gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act respecting the issue of certain Debenture Bonds of the Colony.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

Mr. Walsh gave notice of question.

Dr. Jones, gave notice of question.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, May 21st, 1920.

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

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

Surplus Trust Account.

Statement of Public Debt to July 30th, 1919.

Balance sheet of Treasury Accounts for year ended 30th June, 1919.

Balance sheet of Treasury Accounts for year ended 30th June, 1919.

Statement of Current Account of the Government of Newfoundland, for the year ended 30th June 1919.

Colonial's Secretary's Departmental Trust Account for the Fiscal Years 1918-1919.

Hon. The Minister of Justice presented the following report.

The select committee appointed to consider the proposed Bill of the Montreal Trust Company, beg to report that although the notice called for has not been given, no harm can be caused thereby.

The Select Committee recommend the Bill to the House and are of the opinion that it should be introduced in spite of the fact that the notice has not been given.

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill respecting the Montreal Trust Co.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance & Customs, the Bill entitled, "An Act respecting the issue of certain Debenture Bonds of the Colony was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE & CUSTOMS—The late Government during their term of office endeavoured to raise a loan of $6,000,000. Five million was raised in Canada and one million locally. The million raised locally was not signed by the late Minister of Finance, and Messrs. Wood & Gundy are very anxious to have it signed; the contract requires that this shall be done by the late minister. This bill provides the necessary legal authority so that the signing by the late minister will be legal.

(Notice of Question)

Mr. Walsh asked the Hon. the Minister of Shipping or in his absence the Hon. the Prime Minister to lay on the table of the House a detailed statement showing (a) The total cost of operation the coastal boats, Prospero and Portia from November 15th to date. (b) Total earnings for same service for same period.

MR. WALSH asked the mah ,.r.; u

Mr. Walsh asked the Hon. the Minister of Public Works to lay on the table of the House copies of all tenders received by his Dept. for a contract to operate the Motor Ferry Service between Branch and St. Joseph's in St. Mary's Bay and all correspondence in reference said contract.

Dr. Jones asked the Minister of Public Works whether instructions have been sent out for the conduct of the Road Board Elections in the District of Harbour Main on May 31st Also to name the parties, if any, instructed to carry on the elections in Colliers, Conception Hr., Kitchues, Avondale, Hr. Main, Chapel's Cove and Holyrood.

The Hon. Prime Minister, acting on behalf of the Minister of Shipping and the Minister of Public Works who were absent stated that replies were in course of preparation and would be ready by Tuesday.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 86 of the Consolidated Statutes of Nfld. (Third Series) entitled Of Stipendiary Magistrates and Justices of the Peace" 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 teh concurrence of that body in its Provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend Cap. 27 of the Consolidated Statutes of Nfld., (Third Series), entitled "Or Death 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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act concerning the Registry of Midwives," 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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 157 of the Consolidated Statues of Newfoundland (Third Series), entitled "Of the Fire Patrol."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Scammell took the chair of committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

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

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

Pursuant to notice and leave granted, and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the House resolved itself into a committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions regarding the exportation of Codfish from this Colony.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of committee.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—I would like to say a few words on the resolutions which are now before the chair. Medicine in any shape is hard to take sometimes, and I recognize in those resolutions before the house a dose intended for the fish merchants of Newfoundland. While I agree with considerable that is in this bill, I am not prepared to support it in its entirety. It is a recognized fact to us, the old members of this house, and to the old members of the trade, that considerable abuse has been practised in exporting fish from the Colony, as far back as 30 years ago. I recognize that. To-day, and when I say to-day I mean up to last year, we are practically in the same rut, but then, to correct that takes considerable time. Your opinions may be right, sir, and mine may be right; still, I don't think that we should put our opinions up as infallible, and make them imperative, without listening to the other side of the case. I remember quite well, the year 1897, when fish was two dollars a quintal in this country. We had a large catch of fish in that year, but it was impossible to sell fish at all, cargoes of Labrador fish and fish from the northern bays were held up. There was nobody at that time interested enough to advise what should be done. The only answer to that position was the supply and demand. The demand for the fish was not there. Other countries, Canada, France, and Norway, had fish on hand, and the markets were overstocked. Some gentlemen here to-day will remember that year as well as I do. Mr. Gosse and Capt. Jones must remember it when the best price for fish was from three dollars and fifty cents to four dollars a quintal. Now the fish situation has changed through these years, and no doubt the war period helped to change those conditions, and the conditions we have to-day, we want to improve, and I agree with the minister to a certain extent, that we should do our utmost to better conditions provided we can do so without injuring anyone, but it is a hard matter to adjust.

I recognize that the minister of

marine and fisheries has considerable difficulty in adjusting this, and I realise that he has a deep and sincere interest in this question, more so, in fact, than any other member in this house ever had in my experience for the past twenty-eight years. I recognize that in taking upon himself this work, that he is looking after the mainspring of the Colony, but then it is our duty, on the other hand, to go slow in the matter.

Last fall, when the present government came into power, the rules and regulations proposed at that time by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and sprung upon the Colony, were a great surprise to everybody, but I thought that they were a long felt want, but in the form that they are in to-day, I think that certain sections are a bit arbitrary. It is a hard thing for a man of means to go out and issue supplies to a number of fishermen in the spring and after the voyage is over, and the fish caught, the principal interest that he has is how much he can ge for that fish. Well, it is hard to adjust this matter because there are so many ways that different men can sell fish, as far as I can see, these resolutions mean, that a man after supplying fishermen for the voyage, when it is over, has to come in and consult with a third party, and a disinterested one, as far as these gentlemen who supplied for the fishery are concerned, as to what they will do with their fish.

But then, I can see the force of these resolutions as he explained them when he introduced them here, that if a man sells a cargo of fish at a very profitable figure in one or two places, or at a certain market, the custom, I take it, in the past with the trade here, was, if I had a cargo of fish, that I could realise one hundred or ninety shillings a quintal on, some other merchant jumps in and offers the same fish at one or two shillings less. That goes on until we find ourselves right down to hard pan and the markets overflooded with a half dozen cargoes, some on consignment, and some cash against documents. That is what happened in the past, and that is what caused the minister of marine and fisheries to bring in these resolutions; but on the other hand, is there any other easier way to meet these conditions than by these resolutions. When the merchants of Water Street and other parts of the country read these resolutions and find that they are placed in the hands of the seven men, who, under the amendment, are appointed to the board, I think that they will balk at it. I would balk very much at investing money, if I had any, in the fish business, under these conditions. A man who has any money likes to handle it any way he pleases. But I see the Minister's point of view, that this is intended for the benefit of the fishermen. I can fully realise that the interests of the fishermen must be thought of, and that is the reason we are considering these resolutions here to-day. Last fall when these resolutions were sprung upon the country, the greater part of the trade were in favor of them, and now only six months after, we find the same men, who were supporting them then, are denouncing them now. We who are here representing the fishermen of the Colony, and must of necessity have their interests at heart, at the same time should be fair to the merchants. I have no sympathy for the merchants. I can remember, and I paid my share, when the merchants of the Colony took care to find out the total catch of the fishery before they made a price for the fishermen of the Colony, and I don't want to go back to those days.

The trade has been revolutionized in the past twenty-five years, but how

was it brought about? Not by the merchants of Water Street. It was brought about by the demand for fish on the one hand, and on the other by the drummers and buyers who came here from Canada and the United States and purchased fish in small lots. If we pass those resolutions that are before the chair to-day, we cut out the small man altogether. It will be impossible for him to export fish, because he will not be able to come before the board that will be appointed under these regulations and give satisfaction; but I for one don't want this. I am prepared to give the small man a chance, because I remember that twenty-five or thirty years ago the total catch of fish in this country found its way in through the narrows of St. John's.

Conditions have changed since then. Very little fish comes inside of Cape Pine to-day. It is exported more from the west coast. It is sold to drummers who come here from Canada and the United States. That is what built up the fish industries on the west coast. That was the beginning of Burin and Grand Bank. As far back as fifteen, twenty and twenty-five years ago they sold fish in small lots to Canada, which gradually increased until to-day some of them are the largest exporters we have in Newfoundland. Now I don't think we should cut out any small man, a man who is in the prime of life trying to build up a business for himself, and that is what we will be doing if we pass these resolutions. The minister has asked that we will give certain powers to the men who will be appointed to this board, but if we do so we want to make sure that they are just and will be carried out.

The whole people of the colony are to be ruled by a half a dozen individuals. I say it is unprecedented in the history of the trade of the country to have such conditions as are mapped out in these resolutions here to-day. Conditions regarding the exportation of fish, under these resolutions, within the next twelve months, will be deplorable. Such is not known in any other country that I know of. I am sure it is not happening in Canada or the United States. Here we are going to give away the whole fish business of Newfoundland to half a dozen men. True they may be above suspicion, but then it is a risky thing to do anyway, because the whole fish trade of the Colony is not going to be conserved while in the hands of a half dozen men, no matter how honest they might be. You may, as asked for in these resolutions, send drummers to Europe, United States, Canada and South America to open up fish markets, but at the same time you are frightening away the future fish business men of this Colony.

I recognize, and I know exactly what I am talking about so far as the fish business is concerned, that the exportation of fish in the past has been abused and will be abused no matter how stringent you make these regulations. There is only one way to cope with the situation and that is to standardize your fish when shipping. You can standardize your fish properly, cull your fish properly and ship fish properly, but you cannot prevent an exporter from mixing merchantable, Madeira and talqual fish, if he wants to, by standardizing the fish when leaving a port for the foreign market, and I quite agree with the fee asked for in these resolutions, as it will be money well spent on the part of the Colony to pay a sufficient number of men and honest men to see that the work is carried out and that cargoes are shipped properly.

I believe that if a cargo of No. 1 fish was to be loaded to-morrow for Europe or any other market that the

proper thing to do would be to put one or two men in that store, wherever it might be, to see that no fish would be put on board that ship for exportation, excepting the quality prescribed in the bill of lading and in the invoice. We all know what has happened under the talqual system when fish was bought at the talqual price and in many cases not shipped as talqual, but if you make it stringent upon the shipper, as already detailed by me, you are soon going to change that system.

But I will draw the line and look at the situation from the standpoint of the purchaser and shipper of fish He goes and spends his money honestly and sincerely to buy fish and has to pay the highest price for it, owing to competition, and then he has to go bowing and scraping for a permit before he is allowed to ship that fish. The man who buys fish today has to pay the highest figure for it. He does not get it like we used in 1897 and '98. Take the West Coast. Within the past five years there has been competition in every settlement there. Schooners of all sizes are brought around by the different competitors and there is no chance at all for a man to buy fish as he purchased it twenty-five years ago. The gentlemen sitting on the other side of house know that to be so. If I pay my honest money for fish and after putting it into my store at a cost of ten or twelve dollars a quintal, as the case may be, then I have to go with hat in hand to this board and ask them for a permit before I can ship that fish to any market. In many cases I stand a chance of being refused a permit. In fact that has happened within the past six months. I know that the minister of marine and fisheries has refused permits to several shippers. These people were prepared to sell their own fish on their own terms and at a certain figure. Under the regulations a shipper has got to go to the fisheries department and tell the whole story to the advisory board, namely, the price he is selling for, the price he paid for it, and how much profit he is going to make and then after all that, it is up to the board as to whether or not they will grant the permit.

Now that is a very arbitrary regulation. I am quite prepared to back anything that will forward the interests of the fishermen of the colony, but I am not prepared to turn down the small business man and the small shipper. Take conditions to-day on the West Coast. There are many fishermen there not being supplied in Newfoundland at all. There are quite a number of people in Bonne Bay, Bay St. George and right down to Fortune Bay and in Fortune Bay, who are taking their supplies from Halifax to-day. There is an enormous business done on the West Coast and the supplies are brought around by a steamer owned by Farquhar and Company of Halifax. Now, under the regulations these people are not allowed to sell to Farquhar because Farquhar is disallowed from taking fish to Halifax without first coming to St. John's to look for ap ermit. Surely you do not want to destroy that West Coast trade.

The people on the West Coast at the present time have a great advantage over what they had 25 years ago. Twenty-five years ago a man brought his whole voyage to St. John's to sell. To-day he is selling in an open market with St. John's on the one side, Nova Scotia on the other, not to mention all the drummers that are scattered all over the West Coast I am sure that we do not want to turn the men down and I am sure that the minister in charge of this measure does not want to turn them down.

Those big shippers of fish now on

the West Coast, as I have previously referred to, came right up the ladder gradually, made a small profit gradually, and gradually increased their trade until they came to be among the largest fish exporters in Newfoundland. Surely you do not seriously intend that that big business on the West Coast is to be controlled by half a dozen men in St. John's, no matter how experienced they may be. I have every confidence in the minister in charge of this measure so far as his honesty is concerned, but no matter how honest he may be, there is a certain amount of suspicion surrounding him in relation to the trade of the country, because, as admitted by himself in this house and as talked about it by other people outside this house, he is the chief one of the largest organizations in this Island, and which organization is one of the largest exporters of fish that we have; and it is only natural to expect that he will feather his own nest first.

Supposing a port in Europe needed half a dozen cargoes of fish tomorrow, which at a very good figure netted a good profit. The chairman of the board is the hon. minister of marine and fisheries, and is it not unreasonable to think that one of his cargoes would go forward first to help to fill the breach? Certainly he is not going to telegraph the west coast exporters. And I would not place any great blame on him for doing that, but this and other things create a suspicion by your putting this big industry into the hands of five or six men to control. It may happen in future years that, owing to these regulations, no matter how we try to keep the price of fish up, it will come down. It may happen within the next two or three years. It happened before remember and history repeats itself. I am half inclined to agree with the resolutions passed by the Board of Trade to-day. These men are men of considerable experience. Some of them have been in the business forty years. They are very much alarmed over this question and there seems to be unanimous disapproval among them over the regulations.

I was in the States and Canada last year and I found that I could sell four thousand quintals of fish f. o. b. St. John's at a very profitable figure. I was informed by wire that I could get the fish, but the first thing I was up against was the regulations laid down in the department of marine and fisheries. Well, after going into the matter I found out that other people had been ahead of me and that other cargoes were on hand there. I came to the conclusion that I would not be considered in the matter, as I had found cut indirectly that I would not get a permit. Now I consider that that was a hardship on me.

After all when you take a hundred or two hundred drummers and get them abroad, they are going to sell more fish than the half dozen men on the advisory board. If you think not, you are making a mistake. We want more markets. We want drummers sent to Europe and the United States to see fish put up in different forms. All that can come if we look after it properly. Take our dry cod fish to-day in the United States? There is practically none of it eaten there. Why, because we cure it dry and hard, and the Yankee, whether man or woman, is too busy to eat Newfoundland dry cured codfish because the first thing they would have to do is to soak it for twenty-four hours before they could eat it. But what is the position so far as the American sh is concerned?

They put in packages something like the way the lobsters are packed and the housewife on the way home will go in and buy a package of fish

and go home, boil it or cook it as the case may be. But if she is going to use the Newfoundland codfish, take the dry fish, she has to soak it in water for twenty-four hours; she will experience a stench from the fish although it may be perfect, and she will immediately think the fish is not fit for human food. There is room enough in the United States, which have a population of over one hundred million people to-day living side by side with us, is there not for half if not the whole catch of Newfoundland fish? The fish has to be put up properly if it is going to find the right markets in the United States. They will not up there be in a position to buy our fish unless we do something to put up our fish after the fashion it is put up by the people in Gloucester. We are not going to enhance the price of fish in future unless we do this. We have sent men to South America and Europe to enquire into the state of the market and it is unnecessary for me to tell you what happened, we all know it.

If we come in here and in these resolutions ask that the sum of ten cents be charged on every quintal of fish to pay the expenses of the drummers to go abroad to open up new markets we must keep it up. Now if they go abroad and fail, send others away again and again until success is assured. If we keep on going we will get them. Take the drummers who come down here from Canada and the United States. They come in and put the article right before you and they are not content if you refuse them. They will come back again in a few months. The same thing applies to our fish. We are sending our fish to the same markets for the last century: Brazil, Italy, Spain and the Mediterranean. We have kept ourselves in the same rut for the last one hundred years. But as far as these resolutions are concerned, in part I support them and in part I oppose them. I am not prepared to hand over the fishing industry of this Colony to half a dozen men in this Colony. I would not be one of these commissioners for any amount of money. I do not think the resolutions are entirely right in principle and by adopting them in their entirety I think we are going to give a very bad blow to the fishery of this Colony.

The statement of the Minister that the merchants on Water Street will not give any supplies to the fishermen I do not believe. I am inclined to think that this will not amount to anything. The supplier of to-day and the supplier of twenty years ago are not in the same class. The merchant on Water Street to-day will not be affected by whatever passes in this house as regards supplying the fishermen. But every merchant knows where he supplied last year and all he has to do is to turn up his books and see what profit the planter made last year. So no matter what passes here he will supply him again. I do not agree with the minister when he stated either last evening or the evening before that perhaps a short catch may be a blessing. It would be a blessing and all right if we could not market our fish. One million seven hundred thousand quintals of fish may be only as good as one million three hundred thousand if we cannot get good markets for it. You are asking here for quite a lot of money to pay drummers whom I presume you intend to send away. If we open up new and better markets and our catch of fish should reach one million seven hundred thousand quintals, we would be in a very much better position than if our catch was only one million three hundred thousand.

It is deplorable to see men going away from this Colony to-day to seek

employment elsewhere. It has happened before. When I was a member of this house twenty years ago I remember men leaving here day after day to work in Boston and other cities The men came up here in their hundreds to ask employment, but they had to leave this Colony. Every man who left here and went through the narrows should be making a living here. These men sent back the money to their families. They were energetic men and a loss was attached to their leaving. These men who had families dependent upon them had every right to leave the Colony when they could not get work here. If there had been work in this Colony they would have been encouraged to remain here. I think it is deplorable to have men leaving here to seek work elsewhere.

Because of the spurious promises and the difficult position of the present government, there is a shortage of men here if the work required to be done, were done. If the problem of repairing the railroad were gone into some four or five hundred men would be required. Why not come in here and legislate in that direction, and you have to legislate so far as the railway is concerned, and the right time to do so is the present. Now the men quite capable of doing that work are at this very moment passing through the narrows. Every man throughout the Island who has a family dependent upon him will be employed in some direction either inside or outside the Colony. I took up the paper to-day and see another one hundred men are leaving for employment abroad. Every ship that leaves here carries away some men and yet the hon. minister some forty-eight hours ago tells us that it is a good thing to have those men going abroad. Well I am not going to put a wrong construction upon what he said. I will call it a slip of the tongue. We should like to see men coming into the Colony and lots of work offered to them. But it is not difficult to get work here at the present time. If the necessary machinery were put in operation many men could be given work. There is no reason why the men of Conception Bay should have to go and dig down in the mines at Sydney. Labor in the city costs four dollars per day and I do not see why men should be compelled to leave this country because of this lack of proper manipulation. If you are in earnest in your promises, if you are in earnest with regard to your obligations to this country, then you should protect those men and keep them in this Colony by having the necessary work done. By employing them and paying them the revenue of this country is increased.

We are here now and it is nearly the first of June and not one act has been passed since the opening of the house which is of any importance to the betterment of this country. You cannot point to one act on the statute books passed up to now by the present government which is of any importance. In the manifesto of the Prime Minister last fall it was promised that this house of assembly would be opened about February and all the necessary legislation would be passed and the house closed before April. It was promised that the railroad would be attended to the first thing, and the Government know and I know, and the country knows that it is in a bad condition, and the country is waiting for the improvement, but they have not done it and there is no reason for not strong enough to do it, or they are afraid to do it. This is the statement I want to voice, but I am getting away from the subject before the chair. Anyway the Government of the day are not arbitrators on this matter.

Many people of the country are solely dependent upon the railroad and it is the duty of the Government to get to work on the railroad and employ those men who are leaving the country for the United States. Surely they ought not to experience any difficulty in getting enough of men to do the job. Labor to-day in certain lines is not at a premium. It is no use waiting till the fall of the year, maybe when there may be a bad fishery to go out and start work on the railroad. No good trying to do the work when a foot of snow is on the ground. If they were sincere in their promises to this country, being now in receip of a lease of power they should get right to work now and remedy the rotten conditions existing.

But I am not entirely in accord with the resolutions from the Board of Trade. I believe when you come down to Water Street and try to get two-thirds of the merchants to agree to anything you are up against something. I would turn right around and vote for one-third instead of two-thirds. I think the minister ought to consider that. You take that committee of five men and you ask us to place the whole matter of the export of codfish from the Colony in their hands. Even with seven men on the committee that is not good enough. The trade should be consulted, and the exporters should be called together when two cargoes are going to a place where one cargo would supply the demand.

I am inclined to hold to the resolutions that if the board is constituted of men who have the confidence of the trade and the fishermen of the colony it will have a beneficial effect. But we can't get those men from the Government ranks, not even in the Executive Government. Mr. Coaker himself is the nearest to it. Then there is not another. He is the only man in the Government who knows anything about the fish business and he would have his own way. We are asked to be satisfied with the appointments of the Governor-in-Council. We are going to leave it in their hands to appoint the board. They don't know anything about fish themselves, and if they don't know anything about fish themselves they don't know anybody who do.

You have no control whatever in the matter; the law of supply and demand will take care of that. The Frenchmen, you must remember, were practically out of business since 1914, but they are coming back now and they are to be more dreaded than ever before. This year they will have sixty or seventy steam trawlers operating on the Grand Banks, and besides the old square riggers will again be in operation. To my mind the Frenchman is going to prove a dangerous competitor for us, and if their fishery operations are a success this year, they will have as many more steam trawlers operating next year, and in the space of four or five years they will have two or three hundred of such vessels fishing on the Banks. They are also beginning to look to the scientific side of the question and are in that way becoming more and more proficient each year. Last year there were two or three trawlers out, and during the months of June and July they found fish scarce, but were at a loss to account for it as they had found fish plentiful early in the spring on the Quero and Western Banks. The answer to it was this. During the season there are three schools of cod in over the Banks. The herring school in the early part of the season, the caplin school in June and July and in the fall the fish that come in after the squid. Now during the herring school these trawlers got a good deal of fish, but when the caplin came in they were unable to get any be-

cause while their nets, which are lowered to the bottom and dragged along by wire cables, were sweeping the bottom, the fish had come to the surface after the caplin and the line and bull-tow men, using what are known as floating trawls, were getting all the fish they wanted. Later in the season, however, when the weather got cold, the fish were again on the bottom after another kind of bait, what are known as wrinkles, and the Frenchmen, who still carried on were again successful. Last November one of those modern trawlers went out from St. Pierre and in eight days she was back again from the Banks with 4,000 qtls. of fish. She had a crew of twenty-four men and the trip was made more or less as a sort of experiment. They worked two nets and as fast as they could be lowered and hauled up the fish was taken in.

Now the day is sure to come when that kind of thing will be general. We may doubt it as we will; we smiled to ourselves when people spoke of crossing the Atlantic in airplanes, but it was done, nevertheless, and if others are making these strides and we stand still where are we going to be left. The United States is not behind France and in a few years the use of bait will be done away with altogether. We must keep all these things before us and not discount the value of our own fisheries. I am prepared to do anything that will help to improve them and I shall support any measure, with that object in view, that might be brought in here, regardless of what side of the house it may emanate from.

The fishery is our one great heritage; there may be side issues, but the fishery is to this generation the principal industry, and it will be such for a great many years to come. We should also remember that our fish is now at top notch; it is a luxury in the countries where it is sold, and we are getting big prices for it, and if our fishermen are not able to make a living out of it there is something wrong somewhere. So far we have been fortunate, as a matter of fact, during the war I think we were the most fortunate country concerned in the struggle. When the war broke out we were practically on the rocks, but good prices for our fish helped us to get on the top wave of prosperity. Therefore why cannot we come in here now and put party politics aside in the interests of the country as a whole. I would vote for this entire bill now if I thought that it would not impose a hardship upon our people, in other words if I thought it would be a success, but I don't think it will be a success. It might be all right for the big man who has a choice of markets, but it is bound to block the small man and it is the small man we must help, because it is he we have to thank to a very great extent for getting us where we are to-day. I remember in the old days when the few merchants on Water Street fixed the price in the old commercial rooms. There were only a few of them who had everything in their own hands and they made prices to suit themselves, but to-day we have a hundred and one exporters, and the small men have been responsible for finding new markets and thereby getting for the fishermen a decent price for their fish.

I agree with the hon. introducer of these resolutions that something should be done to improve the marketing of our fish, but he has gone beyond the limit when he tries to take charge of a whole big indusrty and put it into the hands of five or six ment. That is not considered good enough by anybody and here is the proof of it. When he put his regulations into force under the old War Measures Act the Water Street mer-

chants, or a great many of them thought the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was the New Messiah come to save them from the dire results of their transgressions, but now the same men are shouting "Away with him, crucify him!" It's only a matter of history repeating itself. These men don't want this measure and they are going to oppose it as vigorcusly as they can. I know that. I have talked with many of them, and when this bill goes before the upper house you know what will happen.

If you pass it in this house you won't pass it in the upper house. The men on Water St. are up there and if they are honest and you are wrong they won't pass these resolutions. I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to go slow. Why not form a committee from both this and the upper house; let them take these rules and regulations and let them discuss them. Take them apart from the house altogether and let them try and reach some logical agreement. These resolutions are going to block the whole export of fish from Newfoundland. The regulations last fall made it compulsory for the young man to follow his fish right up after it had been delivered into the hands of the man on the other side. To-day there is no secrecy in trade. You have to come in here and make an open confession to the board. If the merchants on Water Street are not going to make as much money on their exports of fish as they have done in the past then you will very soon find them dropping out of the trade altogether.

But it is not the merchant on Water Street that I am thinking of. I am thinking of the small man who is at the bottom of the ladder and who is trying to work up. The young men who are in the export business today north and south have no opportunity of climbing the ladder with these regulations in force. I see no reason why you don't appoint a select committee from both houses and let them take the resolutions in and let them come down here with their finding after careful consideration, and if they find them acceptable, there is no man more anxious in this house today than myself to pass them. I was in the fish business 35 years ago. I have sold fish from two dollars a qtl. to seventeen dollars a qtl. I fought my battle all down through these years, and although I say it myself I was one of those that helped the young fisherman of this country to become independent, but I wasn't going to come in here and tell everybody how I did it.

Take Mr. Cheeseman over there, he didn't get up the ladder through the merchant on Water Street. He was independent of them, and isn't that what we want? I state right now that we ought to have a select committee of both houses and analyze these resolutions and those of the Board of Trade, and if we find that it is absolutely necessary to make rules and regulations as laid down here then I am prepared to vote for them.

I wish to remark that last year when making the financial statement for the House of Assembly I recommended to the Government the very idea introduced here to-day in this bill (Business Profit Tax). That is the tax of one half of one per cent. on all moneys remaining on savings deposits in the banks of the colony, but I did not recommend it on the current account deposits, as on these the banks made little profit. I recommended this because of the simple reason it was an easy way of arriving at the tax. There is, as a rule, a lot of inconvenience, friction and all kinds of trouble when a bank is making up its statement at the end of the year. It has to consult the head of-

fice. So we figured out that a tax of about one quarter or one half of one per cent. and I suppose the financial minister has figured out what this tax will mean when compared with the amount received last year from the banks. But when he states that there are about thirty millions of dollars on deposit in the banks he is incorrect, because last year we discovered that about sixteen millions were there. A lot of money was withdrawn from the banks last year and debentures were purchased instead.

Now when the Finance Minister puts down the tax at one half of one per cent, I guess he has figured out what he is going to receive. According to the statement last year he received something over seventy thousand dollars in taxes. Now the reason why it was recommended was because it was a business way of getting at it, and you could not go in and demand the money at any time, and there could not be any getting behind the screens about it. I believe it is the right thing to do, but I would not like to see it injure the trade of the Colony as it may, according to the statement of the gentleman on the other side. If it is injurious to the trade what the bank is called upon to pay, well then the whole thing will come back upon the taxpayers and it will be seen that the goods will rise maybe fifteen per cent. in price. But I do not think it should include deposits on current account. The Bank of Montreal handles all the money of the Government departments, and it would make a great difference if the current accounts were included. I agree with the Finance Minister that that is the right thing to do if the tax of one half of one per cent is not too much. I am not prepared to say that it is or not. In spector O'Rielly last year had no trouble in collecting the taxes. All he had to do was to send along the bill and the whole matter was easily accomplished.

MR. SULLIVAN—In rising, Mr. Chairman, to discuss the bill now before the house, I want to preface my remarks by saying that I will be brief and that I am not going to oppose the bill on the whole. Last November or December when the resolutions were sprung upon us I was opposed to them because, like many others, I did not understand them. But since that time a change has taken place and the men who were then lauding the resolutions to the skies are to-day denouncing them. What then has made these people change their opinions so quickly? I don't know. I am however prepared to support any legislation that will better the masses of this country. I believe that some kind of fish regulations are absolutely necessary and that it is the general consensus of opinion, but where we seem to fall down is how we are going to carry out these regulations.

Yesterday I listened to the speech made by Sir John Crosbie, and if I wished to think as he did I could easily fall in line with him. Then the hon. minister of marine and fisheries also made a speech dealing with the regulations from his point of view, and if I were not well balanced I would have found it difficult to keep an open mind, but I have done so. We are here in this house to vote as we think best. Now sir, I was opposed to some of the clauses in this bill when it first came in here, but now the hon. minister has seen fit to amend the last portion of Section 1. He reads as follows: (Reads section).

The last part I took exception to. I consider it is not right to give the President of the Board of Trade the appointing of the nominee of the Board of Trade to the commission. After all, there's nobody infallible, and I do not think it would be wise

to give the president of the Board of Trade the privilege of appointing the nominees. This winter while in London and at a time when the people in this country were being told that the fish regulations were ruining our trade, I lunched with a London broker. This man had been knocking the fish regulations when they were introduced, but he admitted that if it had not been for the fish regulations the price of fish would probably be down fifteen or twenty shillings below what it was at that time. This man had no direct interest in exporting from Newfoundland, but had been doing a brokerage business with some of the fish exporters. When he admitted that the regulations were beneficial I was prepared to take his word.

Now then, I see no reason why I should not give the introducer of this bill an opportunity to carry out his ideas as outlined in the bill before the house. As head of that great organization of fishermen known as the F. P. U., he has had several opportunities of visiting the foreign fish markets and familiarizing himself with the requirements of the different markets, and I am prepared to give him a trial. He is not leaping in the dark and is prepared to stand or fall by the regulations. There is no person stands to lose more if the regulations are a failure; his whole future depends on the regulations being a success. If he is wrong and the regulations fail, then his public career is very likely over. Let us give him a chance to make good. Having followed his work closely for many years I have yet to learn that he is wanting in common sense, and I say again give the hon. minister of marine and fisheries an opportunity to carry out his program.

I have no interest in the fish regulations, no interest in the exportation of codfish, except that I want to see the fishermen of the colony get a fair show. The minister of marine nad fisheries stated here yesterday evening that he is beginning to get suspicious of the obstruction he is meeting with in regard to these resolutions from the merchants who supported them so strongly last fall. I am wondering myself what is the reason for it. Those men were with him heart and soul last autumn, and if I went down and discussed the regulations with them, I would be told I was wrong, because of the view I held. Have they changed because they think they will not be able to make as much profit off the fish? They know that the minister of marine and fisheries will know the proper price of fish in the foreign markets, and that he will stand behind the fishermen of the country, and especially the fishermen of the north, who sent him here. They know that he will give these men the best price he can for fish. Are they afraid they might not make sixty thousand dollars on three or four small cargoes, as some did last year? I think any man should be satisfied with a profit of a dollar on a quintal. Is that the reason that they are now knocking these resolutions?

I believe that the rules and regulations governing the standardization and export of codfish will go far to help us to sell all our codfish, and increase our exportation to the foreign markets. I have listened to the speech made by Sir Michael Cashin, and he has talked of the sending of trade commissioners abroad, and the impression I gathered from his remarks was that a man is not allowed to send his own representative abroad. However, I am glad to hear from him now that that was not his meaning and that an exporter has a perfect right to send his own men to the

foreign markets to get the best price he can. With the new cull it should be easy to get a good price for fish, and to keep our prices up, and if we once get our name up in the foreign markets for delivering the good article, we will have no trouble to find a market. What we want the members of this advisory board to have when they are appointed is a little common sense and discrimination, and not to stick always to the hard and fast rule laid down. If they find that a man is able to sell his fish at a shilling or two less than they are prepared to allow him, then let them use that discrimination, and do not let them crush that man and cause his ruin, when it is unnecessary. Let them give him a chance to sell his fish at a fair profit.

I do not see how this measure is blocking the small man. After all any man who is an exporter, will ship five hundred quintals of fish, and pay a tax of ten cents a qtl. on it. That is only fifty dollars; it is not much; and any man who is not able to export five hundred quintals, had better stay out altogether. The fisherman who only ships 100 quintals pays no license fee, only ten cents per quintal. Now why should we not control our prices? As far as I can see, the most of the articles imported into this country, the price is controlled. When we want to buy from Canada or the United States, they tell us this is our price on flour, pork, or beef, as the case may be; you may take it or leave it. We get the article and we have to pay cash against documents for it. I know when we bought sugar in New York last year we had to pay cash in New York for it before wegot the sugar, and we did not get it afterwards. Now take molasses from Barbados. It is a dollar and eighty-five cents a gallon wholesale C. I. F. here. They do not ask us what we are prepared to pay for it.

We do not want to stay in the groove that we have been in for the past, that we were in one hundred years ago. If people want to buy your commodities, let us insist on the same terms as we get when we buy theirs.

As far as the advisory board is concerned, I cannot see that we are injuring the fishery of the colony by giving the control into the hands of seven or eight men, as has been stated. From my experience in the past I was led to believe, that the whole fishery exportation of the colony was in the hands of eight or nine men, and it would be no more to-day under the commission. How many exporters have we in this country? We have nine or ten in St. John's and outside these, we have Harris of Grand Bank, and Ashbourne in Twillingate, and a few large exporters who control the exports of fish. Now under this act we will have seven men on the board, and the men on this board will be exporters of fish, men who know all the details in connection with our fish trade. If the board is not composed of those men, then the minister is not the man I think he is, but I fail to see why we should allow the fish exporters to nominate six men for the Board. I, for one, would not approve of that. Now it is very difficult to come to an opinion on this matter. The man who is presenting this bill is an exporter of codfish. He has travelled year after year to the foreign markets and has delved deep into these matters, and he tells us that this is a good measure. If this is not a good measure, he will be ruined, and the union he represents, will snow him under, and he knows that. Now this man is not a fool, and if he is prepared to take that chance, then I think that we should give him a chance to make good, if after an-

other year these regulations prove no good, then we can turn them down. Personally, I am prepared to give him a chance. This bill may not be perfect, there is nothing perfect. Let us get together and forget politics and try to work this thing out to a satisfactory conclusion. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has told us that he will grant us concessions that are reasonable, and in consideration of this, I cannot see very much objection to these resolutions. I do not know if it is the intention to fix a price for the purchase of fish in Newfoundland. I think it is only right to fix a minimum price for the purchase of fish, and tell the fishermen of the colony what price they can demand. With reference to the men going away, I do not look on that with very much alarm. The most of these men who have been overseas, and they are not prepared to stay here, They have no intention of going fishing, they have different ideas since they were across the water, and we need not be alarmed very much over that. I am sorry to see them go. There is plenty of labor in the country, but they want a change, and that is why they are going. If there are fishermen going away and there may be a few, well it may reduce our catch somewhat. If there is any amendment that can be brought into this bill that will be for the betterment of the people, I will certainly support it, but before I support it I want to be convinced and I will be convinced that it is in the interest of the masses, and not the classes. Last fall there was a more of optimism running over this country, with regard to the fish regulations. Now, pessimism has taken its look on the bright side of things. Let us give these fish regulations a chance. If they are to give the fishermen of the country a better price for their fish then it is incumbent upon every member of this house to support these resolutions and I believe that they will do that, and for that reason I am prepared to give them my hearty support.

HON. MR. FOOTE:—The district I represent is one of the greatest fish producing districts in this Island and I have therefore been most anxious to do what I thought best for the interest of the exporter as well as the fishermen. I fear that if this bill is not passed by this house news of its rejection would be cabled to the markets abroad and the price of fish would drop from 10 to 15 shillings per qtl. As far as I can learn the people who are objecting to the regulations give no thought to the exporters who have fish at the present time in the foreign markets on the way, and in Newfoundland about to be exported. The objectors being a few in St. John's who have no fish on hand or in the foreign markets; the object apparently being to do everything possible to bring about a reduction in price in the foreign markets so that fish would drop to a low figure this year in the home market and thereby give a chance to the buyers at St. John's to reap a big harvest on a sale of the next production. The hon. leader of the opposition mentioned in his speech that in the year 1897 fish was down to $2.00 a quintal and some had the audacity to state that it is the wish of some merchants in St. John's to see that fish does drop again to a low figure so as to give them a chance to make a big haul the coming season. It is further rumored some of the objectors against the regulations are interested with brokers abroad, particularly in London, who sell as agents our people's fish in the foreign markets and thereby participate in the earnings of the brokers to the amount some years of twenty-five to fifty thousand dollars. If such is the case some people at least contend that they have good reason to fight this bill particularly in view of

the position that if this bill is passed brokers on the other side will have no longer the opportunity of selling as agents our fish abroad.

The members of the opposition have shown their stupidity and ignorance in stating that not one member of the executive council had any knowledge whatever about fish except the Hon. Mr. Coaker. Now I want to inform the house that I know as much about fish and more than any other member on the opposition side, excepting the leader of the opposition and Sir John Crosbie.

MR. MOORE:—I never heard that before.

HON. MR. FOOTE:—I have caught, salted, helped to wash out, cured, culled and participated in the sale of fish in the foreign markets.

MR. MOORE:—Some fisherman, oh: it must have been a long time ago.

HON. MR. FOOTE:—I know enough about fish to believe in this bill. At the present time there is quite a quantity of fish in the foreign markets, but very little in the stores of this town owned by the people of St. John's. There is therefore very little interest taken by the merchants at the present time to protect present prices to enable the fish now in the foreign markets and in the outports to be exported and sold for reasonable prices abroad. When the regulations of last fall were put in force I felt somewhat diffident as to the advisibility of supporting them as the policy was rather against my ideas (being perhaps somewhat conservative) particularly as the issue and operations of such regulations rather conflicted with the principles of political economy and my idea of the best principles of the trade, but having been instructed of the true facts which showed that the abnormal conditions existing at that time I concluded that in the best interests of all concerned we had no alternative but to enforce such regulations. I therefore supported the regulations and am pleased to know that the course I took at that time was for and in the best interests of all concerned.

MR. WALSH:—Up to the time I took up the paper this afternoon and saw the resolutions passed by the Board of Trade I was opposed to the resolutions that are now under discussion. By going contrary to the resolutions passed by the Board of Trade we will support the best interests of the people of the country, and it is the people, the fishermen, that I am interested in. For that reason I support these resolutions. I want to congratulate the hon. leader of the opposition on the splendid speech that he made here this afternoon. He has shown that he is familiar with every detail, and has a thorough knowledge of the subject. I want to join with the hon. leader of the opposition in asking the hon. the introducer of this bill to take the suggestion that has been offered and amend the bill accordingly. There is no interest so far as I am concerned in obstructing or hampering the legislation of the House, but I think the suggestion ought to be given every every consideration. Another reason why I support this bill is because of the fact that were we now to dispose of the regulations a large amount of last year's catch might be jeopardized. I understand that there are 150,000 quintals of our fish on the other side not yet sold, and that there are about 90,000 quintals in Newfoundland, making altogether 240,000 quintals yet to be sold. If the regulations were taken away I am afraid there would be a great slump. It may put a lot of small outport merchants out of business.

A statement was made here last night by the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries that he knew one exporter who made a clear profit of $60,000 on three cargoes of fish. I have

no doubt that the hon. minister is correct, but if he is correct it is too much. It should be more equitably divided and the fishermen get a greater profit. Almost every year all the catch is in after the first of December there is a rise in price. But these regulations, by the wise council that might be brought to bear in this bill, will give the fisherman a better show, and he will get a better price for his fish. I am of oponion that we must go some where Water Street to look for friends of the fishermen. I have often differed in opinion, and undoubtedly will again, from the hon. introducer of this bill, but if he can secure better prices abroad better prices will be obtained at home and it is the man that catches the fish that I am most interested in.

With regard to the steam trawlers and the work of the French government I would be glad if instead of voting $55,000 for a model farm a half million dollars were voted to develop the fishing industry. I would heartily support such a bill. It is not my intention to delay the House further. If the hon. introducer of the bill will follow the suggestion of the hon. leader of the opposition and submit the resolutions to a select committee I think the bill will receive the unanimous support of the lower house. I care not what the attitude of the upper house might be We had an instance a couple of years ago where a bill was turned down by the upper house because it pinched some of the gentlemen there a little.

MR. MacDONNELL:—Mr. Chairman, before proceeding to deal with these resolutions, I would like to ask the question, which was prompted by the remarks of the hon. member for Burin, as apparently he knows the personnel of this advisory board, has that board already been decided on and who are the members of it?

HON. MR. FOOTE:—The board has not yet been appointed.

MR. MacDONNELL:—You stated that you knew that the north and west would be well represented on the board.

HON. MR. FOOTE:—I know that they will be although the appointment have not yet been made.

MR. MacDONNELL:—If you do not know who are going to be on that board how do you know where the would be members of it belong? I think that it is a pity that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries did not embody the names in the resolutions. I thought that the Hon. Mr. Foote knew more about the board and the likely members thereof than the minister himself. I have listened with a great deal of attention to the Hon. Mr. Foote airing his views about his practical and theoretical knowledge of fish but I dare say that his whole knowledge of fish is about as limited as mine, and all I know is that I can tell the different species of trout and salmon. However, I do not think it altogether necessary to have any specific knowledge of fish generally to talk on these resolutions. As regards the statement that there were not five members in the house who knew whether or not tomcod developed into a codfish and the rejoinder of the hon. Mr. Archibald that the person who made that statement was speaking scientifically, let me say that I will go five better and out the challenge that there is not a single member in this house who can talk about codfish at all from a scientific standpoint and with your permission, Mr. Chairman, let me point out the difference between art knowledge and scientific knowledge. The knowledge derived from the practical handling of codfish is the art knowledge, but the scientific knowledge is acquired by the scientist who can tell the life and habits of the codfish without ever

seeing it just as the scientist knows the different kinds of mineral without ever having seen the stuff. The hon. Mr. Vinnicombe was perfectly right in the interjection that he made. The statement that there were not five men in the house who knew whether or not a tomcod developed into a codfish came from the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries himself. Now although I have no practical knowledge of the codfishery I am going to talk on the fishery regulations and whether I support them or not I am going to put forward arguments that are sound and if they are to be objected to by any hon. gentleman he will have to give reasons to show that they are not sound. I have heard a deal of alk about the inconsistencies of some people because of their objectionable attitude towards these regulations. Now I know people in this house and I could name them if I wanted to, who have dsiplayed every characteristic of inconsistency, except one.

And the people on this side of the House have changed their opinions so often that they have displayed every characteristic of the fact except that they have not had the bigness of mind to justify a change of mind. I found these resolutions both on the platform and in the press and I will not take back anything I then said. They were thrown in on country without any notification or warning and that they had not the right to do. They should have served notice when they intended to force on the country a set of resolutions which dealt with the whole industry of the country. These resolutions were inflicted upon the country in the hasty and ill-judged manner and proof can be given if necessary and I contend according to what has expired these resolutions have not justified themselves as was shown by the decision of the courts when they were declared illegal. Then the government still sitting as executive government instead of acting as Governor in Council and bringing the matter in this house, they dug up an old act which was as extinct as the purposes for which it was discovered and this was the war measures act and under it they inflicted the resolutions on the country. Whether good or bad the method of putting them on the country was rotten and I object to such a kind of legislation and I am entitled to do so. At that time there was diversity of opinion as to whether they were good or bad and many men who up to then supported them and thought them good absolutely condemned them. I was present at a meeting of the board of trade and the resolutions up to that time had been endorsed but at the meeting many of the exporters condemned them. Altho a man may be learned the ordinary man does not know anything about this matter and I ask to be pardoned for talking like this on such a matter. I must admit I have no technical knowledge of the fishery regulations. Now this much I do understand and that is that the minister who introduced tehm said that he introduced them on behalf of the fishermen of the whole country. I am fairly concerned with the interests of the fishermen and very much more so is the hon. minister. But he is not going to protect the interests of the fishermen here this afternoon if this goes through as it is. I have read the bill very carefully and find that certain section (4) and it is upon this very section that I have to make a statement and it is the only one about which I intend to say anything. It particularly affects the fishermen of my district and if you take upon yourselves the passing of this bill you take upon yourselves the responsibility for it. Now with regard to this section four and it reads as follows (reads it). Now I presume that you will insert a exception there and I think it should be. This matter

touches the district I represent. I have repeatedly both on the platform and in the press and have already said in this house and I now again call your attention to the fact that we on the west coast do business different in manner from those on the east coast. We have disassociated ourselves with the way in which they do business here. Now in my district many a man procures a catch of anything up to one hundred quintals of fish and exports it in his own name. He exports in any quantity from twenty-five quintals to one hundred. Under the act each man who exports fish without a license is liable to a fine of fifty dollars. The people there do not sell to the exporter here. They will sell the fish and have it consigned to Halifax either to Farquhar, Smith or Burke, or some one else. Now surely it is not the intention of the government to penalize the poor fishermen who export quantities of fish up to one hundred quintals. Surely you are not going to charge them fifty dollars for a license. And I suggest to the honorable introducer of the bill to put in a covering note to the section something like this. With special regard to the particular conditions appertaining to the west coast which I am sure the hon. member for Burgeo, Mr. Small, will endorse, I would ask that this be inserted and whether or not it will be a sufficient test whether the hon. minister is altogether working in the interest of the fishermen (Reads exception to section).

I am not in this house to speak for the whole country, I am not concerned with the whole country but this closely touches my district and I take a colloquial view of this measure which I suppose will pass this house and become an act of parliament and if it goes through in its present stage it will mean a hardship upon the people of my district and it is my duty to point out this hardship and suggest a remedy. With regard to the other parts of the bill which will become an act of parliament in short I am not competent to voice an opinion. I have had no experience and I would want some practical experience to give an opinion on this matter. I have never been afraid to take a stand for the people I represent and will not be afraid to do so now and if the cover I suggested is inserted I will give my support to the measure.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES:—Well I am prepared to accede to the demand of the honorable member ofr St. George's, Mr. MacDonnell, that the section four shall have an exception that this fifty dollars for license shall not be collected from the fishermen who export fish up to one hundred quintals. But the ten cents per quintal will be collected from them.

MR. MacDONNELL:—As this is done I give my support to the bill (fish regulations).

MR. SCAMMELL:—I would like to ask the hon. member for St. George's if he is referring to both classes of fish, the dry fish and the slop.

MR. MacDONNELL:—I am referring primarily to the dried fish. The other kind of fish does not come under the notice of the exporters of my district.

MR. WALSH:—While I am not able to display any particular experience in the export of codfish I represent one of the largest fishing sections in the country and it is my duty to take part in this discussion before the chair, and I want to announce to the chair my intention to support every part of the regulations and I do so because I am absolutely convinced that the interests of the fishermen can be best served by the passing of those measures.

MR. CHEESEMAN:—Mr. Chairman I just want to say a few words on this bill. About twenty men were at the

board of trade meeting to-day. In view of the fact that there are about seventy exporters in the country I want to ask if in your opinion twenty men are a fair representation of seventy? How about the outports? There are a few men here in St. John's who appear to have an idea that they are running the whole show. But the time has come when St. John's must recognize the fact that she must work in co-operation with the outports and must consider the outports in any measure that affects the entire trade of the country. The resolutions sent in by the board of trade or rather the twenty members who met to-day says something of three days notice being given to the trade when this matter is to be discussed. What can most of the outport exporters do with getting to St. John's in three days. That was calculating without the outport men but the time has come when St. John's must recognize the outport men. The sooner this is done the better will it be for all concerned.

With reference to the bill itself and the resolutions they have been very ably handled and debated by members of both sides of the house. In my opinion the hon. Mr. Coaker has more at stake than any other man in the country. He realizes all that he has at stake and I am sure that he is doing what he believes is for the best interest of the country. There is a big difference of opinion between Hon. Mr. Coaker and Sir John Crosbie. Each is entitled to his opinion, and I see no reason why any member of this house should be governed by either. Every man should be governed by his own honest opinion, especially on this matter that effects the entire country. Personally I am in full accord with the objects of this bill and have much pleasure in giving it my heartiest support. In conclusion I would ask for a closer co-operation between the St. John's and outport business men.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Chairman, there is one feature of the debate on the matter now before the chair which to my mind does not seem to be a desirable one. I refer now to the tendency displayed by some hon. gentlemen to draw a line beteween the merchant and the fisherman, and in my opinion, if we want to give proper consideration to the merits or demerits of the question under consideration we must at the very beginning free our minds from any such bias as has been so freely indicated in this discussion. There is one thing, and only one to be taken into account in our efforts to arrive at a satisfactory settlement of this matter and that is the effect that this measure will have upon Newfoundland as a whole. It must be remembered that we are depending for the development of our fishing industry as much on the exporters as on the fishermen, while at the same time the exporter is as helpless without the fisherman as the fisherman is without the exporter, and for that reason I think that we ought discuss this bill without prejudice, bias or heat.

I fully endorse what my hon. friend, the member for Burin, Mr. Foote, has said of his extensive knowledge of fishery matters, for only a few days ago I had occasion to visit the law office of the Hon. Minister of Justice, and I saw there a picture of Mr. Foote, properly attired in the regulation fishing garb, making a strenuous attempt to land a twenty-pound salmon, and surely no other evidence is needed of his exceptional qualifications as an authority on questions pertaining to the fishery.

With reference to these resolutions, I endorse the suggestions made by the hon. leader of the opposition, that they be submitted to the consideration of a select committee of a number of hon.

gentlemen of both houses to see if by that means we cannot adopt some conciliatory course that will meet the views of all concerned. There are many things in the resolutions that I object to and in my opinion too much cannot be said in condemnation of the principle of restraint of trade and government interference which this measure involves. Such restraint and such interference tend in no way to the advantage of the interests of the people and to prove this I have only to draw your attention to the occasion two or three years ago when the first concerted attempt was made to keep prices down by govermental interference. The very moment the food control board put its regulations into force prices began to soar and I think that in every case where the government interferes in this way the same thing happens. After all the exporters have taken a very sane view of this matter. They say in effect that we are entitled to market the articles of commerce for which we have paid, as we see fit. For instance, take the attempt a few months ago to control prices in the European markets. I know from actual experience that men in the trade of this colony suffered because of these regeulations by the loss of thousands of dollars and all because they were not permitted to do their business in their own way.

As to the constitution of the board, I agree with previous speakers on the point that there should be a larger representation of the trade, and another thing, I should like to draw the attention of hon. gentlemen to is this: With all due respect to the gentlemen sitting on that board, they will become possessed of a knowledge of the affairs of those who have, in their dealings with the board, to give away what may be regarded as business secrets. I do not say for a moment that these gentlemen would take advantage of this knowledge but nevertheless, I think it is unfair that exporters should be expected to give it, and so far as the head ex-officio of that body is concerned it seems to me that he is doing something which he should not do when he sits on that board while he himself directs the affairs of one of the largest exporting concerns in the country. All the information with regard to the transactions of his competitors comes in to his department and he has the benefit of it all and in effect it means simply this. I might have spent 20 or 30 years in working up a trade and by my own brain and energy acquired a knowledge of the markets or even found new markets which other men, not so fortunate, not so capable, not so energetic as I, have not attained, and I must come in and give all the information thus gained to my competitors in the trade. In other words it places the captain of industry on the same level with the inexperienced beginner.

This kind of thing can have but one result, the curtailment of personal initiative, the hampering of trade and commerce and the killing of competition because the same thing applies in the giving of information as to the quantity of fish an exporter has on hand as to the giving away of trade secrets of any other kind. For example, I might know from various sources or perhaps through agents whom I have employed for the purpose, that some particular market requires a considerable lot of a certain quality of fish. Acting upon this information I purchase largely of this quality but under this measure I must give information to the board as to the stocks I am holding.

Now one does need to have that wide experience in fishery matters possessed by the hon. member for Burin to know that if the exporters who are members of the board see that I have

twenty or thirty thousand quintals of Brazil fish in my store it is natural to suppose that they will follow my example in buying this quality, nor is it impossible to imagine them allowing the personal element to intervene by curtailing my shipments to that market in order that they themselves might take advantage of the demand indicated by my holdings. It is all very well for the hon. minister to talk of controlling markets but his arguments in this regard are by no means convincing. The premises are wrong and therefore the conclusion must be wrong. If we had a monopoly on the markets into which we are sending our fish, if we had no competitors there we might induce these buyers to agree to our terms by saying to them, If you do not pay us the price we ask, you cannot get our fish. But our position is an entirely different one. We are going into open markets where we have as competitors such countries as Norway, Iceland, France and Japan, and therefore what chance have we to obtain the prices we want except by having a good article placed in a good fashion and so retaining the high opinion of the market that wants a good article.

Mr. Chairman, when we adjourned for recess at 6.30, I was numerating certain objections to the bill before the house, and briefly they are, first of all, on principle, I fear any attempt to curtail trade, second, I do not like the idea of giving control of the principal industry into the hands of a few men; thirdly, I do not like the unconstitutional procedure of allowing taxes to be collected and distributed without legislative authority, and fourthly, I don't think the regulations ought to be entered upon at all, without the cooperation of the exporters of the country. I know that it is not the intention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to aleniate the sympathies of the exporting classes of the country, that it is not his intention to do anything injurious to them, but I think that some effort should be made to meet the requirements of both classes, the fishermen and the exporters upon whom the fisheries depend for their success.

Now I address myself to these resolutions in as unbiased a spirit as I am capable of. They are worthy of our best consideration, and we should not allow ourselves to have any political ideas or views upon them. We should not look at them in the light of political expediency, an dthrefore I wish to look at them from the broadest possible viewpoint. When my hon. friend stated that he thought the minister of marine and fisheries was sincere, I endorsed that statement. I do so now. It is three or four years since I came into contact with him, and the impression I gained of him was that his outstanding characteristics were sincerity of purpose and the honest desire to better conditions for the men he represents in the Fishermen's Protective Union. I believe that he has their interests at heart, and that he has an honest desire to do the proper thing with regard to these resolutions. I admire him for that, but at the same time he should not forget the right of the exporting classes. As I said before, the country would be as helpless without the exporters as without the fishermen and therefore the interests of both parties should be looked after. I think that some compromise should be effected to meet the wishes of both classes that would tend to improve conditions. I suggest that he meet the exporters half way.

As some of the older members of the house will remember, in my early days I was apt to be loquacious, and more or less commentative, but I have

learned the benefit to be derived from a conciliatory viewpoint. We are here as representatives of the people, to look after the interests of the country, and anything we do should have that object in view. Therefore I suggest that if the minister of marine and fisheries thinks it desirable to have a board with power to make regulations, then let him give the exporters a fair representation on that board, and make no such regulations without first conferring with the exporters of the country. I suggest these facts to the hon. the minister of marine and fisheries, and ask that he give them consideraiton. You must have men on that board who are familiar with the work which that board will have to do.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—You could not take an ordinary man and put him in the position of minister of marine and fisheries. Only an exporter, one with practical knowledge, who was engaged in and knew something of the business, should be in charge, otherwisc all our work will be in vain. As an exporter of fish, I gleaned considerable knowledge within the past two cr three years as to the requirements of the different markets. I have gone through the different markets and I know the business in connection with the exportation of fish pretty thorcughly. It has been suggested that someone on the advisory board may get information from time to time and use it at the expense of someone else. Well the position is this: We have a minister of finance and customs who is in charge of the business profits tax and income tax. There is no other official in the executive council, not even the prime minister, who knows the confidential business of that department. Similarly, the business of the Fishery Regulations will go through the hands of the minister of marine and fisheries, and if someone did use private information deliberately, we would find a way to deal with him no doubt. But I cannot see how this business is going to be injurious to exporters on the board and all with an equal knowledge of circumstances in connection with the carrying out of the regulations. I cannot see, how the regulations could be productive of much good unless in the hands of a minister who is an exporter, and if he is bad enough to use information, we will soon show his hand. If we had six representatives on the board beside the minister, not one of them being under the thumb of the minister, as some people imagine, how can harm come to the trade. If I put agents of the Union Trading Company on the board, you would have some justification for complaint, but where you have a number of men, the largest exporters of fish, on the board, who will see that everything done is fair to the trade, then all reasonable ground for objection are removed. I must say this for the advisory board, that there has not been a single instance in any shape or form in which one man has used confidential knowledge for his own benefit. Absolutely nothing has come to my knowledge thus far.

My hon. friend, Mr. Fox, has stated that it is unconstitutional for the department to collect moneys under the regulations. If he will look closely into the act, he will find that under Section (6) moneys collected by the minister of marine and fisheries are to be handed over to the treasury of the Colony. We collect the fees as we collect the tax on Scotch herring and hand them over to the treasury department, and, furthermore, all moneys will be paid out by cheque. We do not want to have, say, a hundred thousand dollars paid into the fisheries department and then spent

as we would wish ourselves, accounting to none, but rather we are making provision to have it passed over to the treasury. A suggestion had been made in the shape of an amendment regarding the holding of conferences with the exporters. I accept the suggestion and I am quite willing to have a conference of all exporters convened in St. John's at the beginning of the season so that we could have plenty of time to thrash out the regulations, not that I hope to do as they might decide, but for consultative purposes. The entire board could be present and we would have an opportunity of listening to the various speakers and note suggestions and objections made concerning the regulations from time to time, with a view to the bettering of the regulations. As I said before, we would not be bound by what the conference would decide.

I have also got a clause in this bill for the fixing of price and terms of sale. This will have the effect of doing away with the shipping of fish on consignment, which I believe is a very necessary step. This is a matter that could be discussed at a conference of exporters. I think it would be necessary to give two or three weeks' notice to outport merchants when convening a meeting in order to give them time to get there. I do not think that any big number of conferences held during the year would be found workable, because after holding a couple people would be inclined to get tired and disinterested, but we could have one or two general conferences annually which would be well attended. You must have confidence in your board. The minister is here to represent that board and to put these regulations on trial in this house. If we adopt a regulation, that regulation will only be adopted by the government, when the government are clear about the necessity for such. This is the first precaution. The next precaution is that there will be a subcommittee of exporters appointed by, I hope, an association of exporters ready to give us advice with these regulations.

I believe that before long the fish exporters themselves will become an association. The association can select a committee of say half a dozen men who will always be avilable to advise us and we can discuss matters regarding the markets at a meeting which could be convened within twenty-four hours. We intend to take the trade into our confidence.

I must certainly express my appreciation of the manner in which the opposition have discussed this matter. I am especially thankful to the hon. leader of the opposition for the way he has dealt with this subject. His remarks were very fair, very instructive and very helpful. It was probably too much to expect him to stand up here and endorse these resolutions in every respect. I am sure that the house has seen that he is a big enough and broad enough man to deal with this matter this evening as he has. On behalf of this side of the house I must offer him my congratulations. I am sure that the regulations will eventually work out successfully. I shall try to meet the wishes of the house in these resolutions, and my only regret is that I cannot consent to have this matter submitted to a select committee for the reason that we have already gone as far as it is possible to go to give the exporters a fair and reasonable participation in the making of these regulations. We have made our committee seven men instead of five. We have insisted that all members of the board should be exporters of fish. On the other hand you must expect that the fisheries department in future will be presided over by the most capable and experi-

enced men in the government. The day for small men occupying the position of head of the fisheries department has passed. In future the very best men must be selected for that position, therefore this in itself will be a safeguard with regard to the carrying out of the fishery regulations and control. If we have a select committee what can come out of it? We will not be able to arrive at any better solution than we have. We cannot do any better. We have in the bill given all concerned enough power and means of finding out information as to what we are doing.

Then on the other hand every member is an exporter, and the interest of every member of the board is the same and they are doing this work of regulating the export of fish, it is true, for the benefit of themselves, and that being so it will surely be for the benefit of all the exporters. And they will not be able to take advantage of these regulations if the plans which I have inaugurated are put into operation. On several occasions I have stood for outright sales. But the whole of our efforts will be killed if the consignment system is still continued. Under the regulations, all fish shipped to Oporto, Spain, or Italy should be on an outright sale basis and every exporter will therefore be on equal footing. There may be advantages if the fish is sold on consignment. Then the business man can utilise the tricks of the trade and his personal influence over some people and somewhat help himself. But if the price of the fish is fixed at 80|— and the terms are outright sales and cash against documents, every exporter will have the same advantage.

Every exporter will have the same advantages, but each will have to look for orders for fish and have his private agents abroad seeking business. We are not going to do anything as to the filling of orders in our department. We will simply fix the conditions under which the fish is to be exported. Every exporter who has been accustomed to sell fish for instance in Oporto, will have an agent there to secure orders for his fish. Mr. Duder and Mr. Monroe represent some big firms buy fish in Brazil. These firms are going to buy the fish from the people with whom they have been dealing in the past. The firms who have bought fish from Baird, Barr or Monroe in the past and have found their fish of good quality, will still give them the continuance of their orders. There is no advantage by being on the board in this respect. The terms of export are all alike. Every exporter will be on equal footing and no one will have an advantage over another. The only thing left to be done by the private individual is to get the orde for his fish. For Oporto the sales will be outright and not on consignment and the agent there will go round among the twenty fish dealers and ask them for cargo orders. He will ask, "Will you give me an order for a cargo from the Trading Company?" "Will you give me an order for Bowring Brothers, for Baird, or for whom he may represent?" The price of the fish will be all the same. The fish will be standardized, say eightty shillings for No. 1 seventy-five for No. 2 and seventy for No. 3 When a man gives an order for one thousand of each quality he knows what he is going to get. All will have the same advantage as the members of the board. The board deliberated on these regulations night after night and attended meetings night after night, and our thanks is criticism and misunderstanding.

There is no pay for anyone on the board. Those on the board will have enormous responsibility and lots of work, but no pay. I see no way to

have it more perfect. Give it one year's trial. If then any imperfections are discovered, the regulations can be easily altered. If the exporters will co-operate for one year, we shall see what good will result. These regulations may not have to be put into force unless we get a fairly good catch of fish. We shall. I hope, have no sales but outright sales and the buyer shall give a guarantee of payment in London, or as the case may be.

The exporters will make fair profits from the operation of the regulations, but they are afraid they will not make profits big enough in the early part of the season as they have been doing in the past. The buyers are afraid that the prices will be bigger than they are prepared to pay, but that cannot be except in the case of clean markets. These regulations are going to prove a revolution in fish buying. The fishermen will figure according to the regulations and will be able to tell what they are going to get for their fish. They will be able to sit down and calculate what they will secure for their products. My interests are chiefly the interests of the producers in Newfoundland. But considering the exporters generally, I sincerely believe they will profit by the regulations. I want all who export fish to do so on a sound business basis and I believe they will make money and they will not have any claims. They will not want big prices to make up for their losses because they will not have any claims under these regulations. The fish will be standardized. There will not be any losses because of their fish being rotten, inferior or uncured. I feel sure that all cargoes of fish shipped under the regulations will be good. There will be a tremendous revolution under these regulations in buying fish. But they are not going to injure Newfoundland in any conceivable way. I would not welcome these changes if I saw they were going to be detrimental to the trade. But if the trade backs them it will be in the interests of all concerned and I firmly believe that good will accrue to the trade. As pointed cut by the hon. member for Placentia, Mr. Sullivan, that if I should make a mistake here, it will fall severly on myself, and if the regulations prove detrimental to the country, I will be the nearest sufferer.

MR. FOX:—I am sure that we have all attempted to be very fair. We recognize that he is willing to be fair, but there is one part that struck us with some force. He said it is I who takes the risk. Now he is only one of the party that takes the risk. The whole country takes very great chances. In 1920 can Newfoundland afford to take a chance? The recognition is general that the same prosperous condition cannot follow. We ought to be particularly careful. I say with all due respect to the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries that it is Newfoundland's risk. He trade will be strangled if the regulations are ruinous. I do not think that the regulations have produced such success as our hon. friend claims for them. Why should they be so unpopular with the trade of the colony, with the exporters, if they were so successful? I recognize the great personal ability of my hon. friend, and I tell him now as I told him the other night that when the names of most of us are forgotten his name will be fresh in the minds of the fishermen of the country. I say to the members of the F.P.U. who are here you may have presidents but only one W. F. Coaker. But, sir, because of the very fact that you have that power I ask you not to abuse it. Take the veil from your eyes. There are men on Water Street who will have their all at stake if these regulations are put in force. I do not believe that you will

do this. I believe you have too much respect for the country, and for the interests of the country. I have appealed to you, and appeal to you again, to do nothing in haste. We cannot afford to risk the interests of the people of Newfoundland. If we want to do our duty we must meet the two classes halfway. Newfoundland cannot afford to take a chance. We can say that the resolutions will be for only one year, but we don't know what will happen in one year. One week may be positively ruinous to Newfoundland.

It would be altogether different if we had a monopoly of the markets of the world. But I want to say that Japan is a serious competitor of Newfoundland in the Mediterranean. If the markets finds that she can get a better product from Japan she will soon take it. We find that the hon. minister says that shipment on consignment will cease. Does he mean that he can say to the trade of this country that Newfoundland shipments on consignment must cease because I believe that shipment on consignment is wrong, is injurious? Is not this a free country where every citizen has the right to conduct his own business? Continuing along the lines that we have been going is the only sound principle under which Newfoundland can progress. This is a free country, and I do not think that the hon. gentleman wants to see the day dawn when this country will be autocratic. Why should the hon. minister be able to say to the exporters of codfish: "You may be able to make $5.00 per quintal profit, but I say that you cannot make more than $1.00." They do it on sound business principle. They have to make the best possible turnover so as to offset possible loss in the future. Under no condition should he be able to say you shall make a profit of so much and no more. I am going to see that you do not make above a certain profit. I am going to bind you to certain definite regulations. There is no possible play for personal initiative or business ability. There is too great a chance. I am not willing to play with the financial standing of Newfoundland.

The Board of Trade represents the exporting class of Newfoundland. Two men of the trade are not enough on the fishery board. I suggest that the resolutions do not come into force until a conference with the trade. A number of men on Water Street are nervous over their business. Why not let this matter stand over until a conference has been arranged with the trade, so that a happy medium may be reached? I think the hon. gentleman will see that I am not taking an antagonistic attitude. I ask him not to take too much on his shoulders. Let the exporters of the country help him in this undertaking.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to say very much with regard to this matter. As a matter of fact I had not intended speaking at all, but when I heard the hon. minister placed in the class of John the Baptist and described as a voice crying for help in the wilderness, I thought it time somebody came to his assistance.

So far as this measure is concerned, I want to say that whatever the results of it may be, whether good or ill, they will be his. To those of us who are not exporters or who have not that vast knowledge of fishery matters which my hon. friend has shown himself to be possessed of, the only result of the debate on the subject has been to leave us in exactly the same position that we were in before. We have heard it stated that the regulations which were put into effect last winter were detrimental to the country and we have o nthe contrary heard the hon. minister state that not alone were the regulations not detrimental but that

great losses would have ensued had they not been put into force.

Of course, the basic principle that should be adopted for the determination of this whole question, is what will prove to be the greatest good for the greatest number. I support the theme of the first resolutions of the Board of Trade, those in which they desired no regulations at all, because I do think that the business of exporting can best be carried on without government control or interference of any kind, and although some of us can only view the principle involved from the academic standpoint, more or less, it does not seem that that principle is in line with the ideas of the ordinary individual; but when we find ourselves confronted with the alternative of amending this bill to hand over complete control of the regulations to the exporters as we are asked to do by these later resolutions, then I think we should chose the lesser evil by adopting the bill as it is now amended, because no government can for a moment consider the principle of placing a law on the statute book and then give control of its administration into the hands of private individuals. If we are to have regulations, and personally I do not see the necessity for them, it is better that we let these regulations go through as they are now amended and make the board more largely representative of the interests concerned. I do think that if the hon. minister has taken his chance and staked his all on putting this measure into effect and if he asks us to stake the interests we represent, the best we can do under the circumstances is to pass it as it is now. I think that even the exporters themselves would see that it would be an abrogation of the rights of this house if we were to fall in with the suggestion made in the latest resolutions passed by the Board of Trade. In other words it would but be legalizing an attempt to kill trade competition. It would be all right if these regulations were not law, for the trade to have the privileges for which they now ask, but if we are to put them on the statute book, it would be a vicious principle for us to have people outside this house to control and mould the law to their own will and pleasure.

The one important point is that whatever our avocations, we are all dependent upon the fisheries, and if the hon. minister is prepared to stake the future of the fisheries of this colony upon his judgment in this matter we can only hope that the results will be what he looks for. It may be that those who now think there should be no regulations are wrong. Time alone will tell, and it will be only in the years to come that we will be able to say whether we were right or wrong. I do say that I pray, not for hte sake of the hon. minister nor for the sake of his followers, but on behalf of the country, that his judgment is right. He has stkaed his judgment and his interests on the result of the step he is about to take. I have no doubt of his bona fides and I am satisfied that he is perfectly honest in what he is doing and I only hope that his policy will have the successful outcome which he predicts for it. I have but to repeat that I am opposed to regulations at all, but there are to be regulations than I would prefer the board to be constituted as in the amended bill than as requested by the last resolution of the exporters.

MR. BENNETT:—Mr. Chairman, I feel that the house should be satisfied with the able manner in which this measure has been debated and I think my hon. friends on both sides of the house may congratulate themselves on the thoroughness with which the matter has been considered. The hon. minister in charge of the resolutions has made reference to the excellent way in which the leader of the opposi-

tion dealt with the subject under discussion and I am sure sir that compliment is well merited. We on this side appreciate his remarks very highly and we reciprocate the compliment to him.

It is not my intention or my purpose to further labor the question as it has already been exhaustively dealt with by my colleagues on this side of the house, but before giving my vote I should like to refer to the impressions left on my mind by previous considerations of this important matter. Last fall when the fishery regulations were put into effect the whole country was puzzled as to what they meant for the time being and when their true inwardness was borne on the minds of the people, dread of the possible results became broadcast, particularly in St. John's. It has been argued that the regulations have had a detrimental effect on the marketing of our fish. This contention is strengthened by the fact that since then fish has fallen price and a general depression has overtaken the markets. On the other hand the contention is that if there was no regulations a very much more serious condition would have occurred. Our convictions in this respect will be governed by the facts as we view them.

Conditions are worse than they have been in the past twenty years, and we should not do anything that might possibly make them worse still. We have the working classes to-day in a mind that is not at all pleasant to contemplate. Everything is at the highest price. The necessaries of life are almost beyond the reach of the ordinary workers, employment is not too plentiful, and the men find it almost impossible to sustain themselves and their families, and if work is going to be still further curtailed through any legislation in regard to the fish regulations, then we should give grave consideration to those regulations which might have such far-reaching effects on the laboring classes. Should not matters turn out as the wise head of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries hopes, and thinks that they will, it will be too late for us to say, "Well, I had no idea such a thing would happen." We cannot take the chance, and, for one, am not prepared to take the chance of such a condition of things coming to pass, without registering my vote against the bill we are now considering. As I said before, I believe the minister is sincere; I believe that he has given this matter serious study, but he is only human, and might fall. Please God he will not fail in this undertaking. If he does not, then all credit to him; but if he does, be the penalty on his own shoulders. I therefore desire to say, Mr. Chairman, that when this bill comes before the house, I will oppose it for the reasons that I have just given, and in doing so, I feel that I am merely fulfilling the obligations I owe to the people who sent me here, because I think this is a chance that we cannot afford to take at the present time.

I think that the man who is strong enough to take upon his shoulders such responsibility will deserve the praise of the whole country if he succeeds. We hope he will succeed and achieve everything he is working for, and if he does, I am sure everybody will give him due credit for what he has done. But the trouble is, can we afford to take a chance? It has been pointed out, that if the minister fails in this undertaking, that it will spell disaster for him in the union that he represents. It is then a very serious matter, and if things turn out wrong, then on his own head be the responsibility. As a representative of St. John's, whose duty it is to voice the sentiments of the people of St. John's, and in view of the conditions that existed last year, that were pointed out by Sir John Crosbie, that there was a

loss to this town, in labor, of something in the vicinity of one hundred and fifty thousand dollars, through the fish regulations, and I rely on Sir John Crosbie's statement. If that is so; if the merchants cannot see their way clear to supply for the fishery, and we have a very small catch of fish this year or next, and if the necessary labor is not forthcoming, well then, sir, I see nothing but ruin and disaster for the laborers of St. John's. If the merchants won't supply, the laborers suffer, and when they suffer the whole community suffers. Are we going to antagonize the men who have the money and capital to carry on the industries of the country? I know that if they stop that others will be found to take their places; but that will take some time, at least two or three years. If these regulations are going to have any such effect on the laboring classes of Newfoundland, then sir I would be neglecting my duty if I did not protest against such a step being taken that would bring about such results. As I have stated, then I want to go on record that it was not done with my approval and support.

Certain remarks fell from the lips of an honorable member on the other side of the house that started me thinking. We have arrived at a crucial period, a period perhaps never approached before in the history of the colony. The whole trade of St. John's practically considered as representative of the country has resolved that this condition of things is dangerous under the present circumstances. The people who passed these resolutions are representatives of a very large portion of the trade of the country, and unless they are irytng to put something over on this legislative there may be some doubt as to the wisdom of proceeding further with these resolutions. I have no brief or reason to speak on their behalf, but knowing the great influence they have in the commercial life of the country the ersults foreshadowed may have serious and far-reaching effect. I certainly think they had gone too far when they asked the legislature to be allowed to nominate the whole board. They want to be one dominating factor and this would be out of the question, seeing that there are other interests and factors in the country to be considered in this matter. I know that the regulations are going to pass and all the members of the government and some of the members of the opposition are going to vote for them in part if not in their entirety, and on their heads be the responsibility. I hope and pray, as our friend Mr. Higgins has said, that they will be alright and that they will turn out as desired, but I cannot help but feel that this will not be so and that disaster may come upon us and we may rue the day that we passed such regulations in this house.

I am perfectly satisfied that the hon. minister is sincere in his contentions that the resolutions before the chair will be of great benefit to the whole country. I congratulate him for an address that he delivered here before this assembly some time ago in which he told of the different fish markets that he had visited in Europe recently. This was probably the first time that the people of this country were enlightened as to how our cargoes of fish were handled and how our cargoes have been sold. The house listened with rapt attention to the speech of the hon. minister and it was certainly appreciated. And I say that it was unfortunate that former ministers of this department did not have the same opportunity. The resolutions that are now in operation, from hearing the minister speak one would feel that they will be of enormous advantage to the country. This may be or may not be so. The situation that we are faced

with since the exporters meeting this morning has taken a different aspect altogether. In consequence the minister has now made the board more elastic. Having seen the danger that might ensue from the establishment of such a board as first intended, he has gone out of his way to give an opportunity to the Board of Trade to nominate certain members on that board. The great danger we have to realize is the giving of authority to a board the component parts of which we know not nor do we know that it would be representative of men from the different districts in the country.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:— Mr. Chairman, some of the remarks of the last speaker have brought me to my feet. I had not intended to take part in the debate, but as the hon. member for St. John's West, Mr. Bennett, has reiterated some of the remarks that we made by previous speakers, I think that some one ought to get up and refute them. Now, through the speech of the member for St. John's West, the theme was, that a half dozen men should not control the individual interests of all the others. This was first brought up by Sir John Crosbie. He said that it is not British fair play, that a certain number should not dictate to the whole trade what they are to do with regard to prices for their own fish. This was endorsed by Mr. Bennett. He then went on to say that the law of supply and demand controls the prices which we are to expect for our fish. I quite agree with him that that law has a great deal to do with it, but you can break that law, and this bill is so framed that the law of supply and demand shall not be broken. The exporters themselves have realised that the law of supply and demand controls prices of fish, but they have tried to regulate the supply and demand. Now I will try to explain what I have learned from the short study of the law of supply and demand. The law of supply and demand means that when the supply is small, and the demand is great, then you get a good price. If the demand is great, you will get a good price, and the smaller your supply, the greater the price you will get; but on the contrary, if the supply is great and the demand is small, you cannot get a good price. When the supply is known and the demand is also known, then you have a perfect market. A perfect market exists when a man knows how much he has got to fill the supply. He may never exactly know what the demand is, but he will try to find out, and he has to try to arrange the supply to suit that demand, and when you have on one hand a man who knows his supply exactly, and on the other a man who knows how much is required, then you have a perfect market, and then the law of supply and demand is at its best.

But can it be said that the law of supply and demand is ever used to the best advantage in Newfoundland? No. but we have to try to regulate the law of supply and demand, that we will get the best price for what we can supply.

We have to regulate the supply. If there is a certain demand for fish at a certain time in a certain market, and suddenly the whole or half the catch of Newfoundland is dumped into that market, what becomes of the law of supply and demand? People who, without any correct knowledge of the demand, suddenly flood a market with a whole load of fish, immediately violates all the rules of supply and demand. Now in these resolutions is a sound and honest attempt to try and carry out the rules of supply and demand, which has been so insistently referred to by the members who have spoken before me. Recognizing that principle, recognizing that the laws of supply and demand regulate the price

of any article, and recognizing that the merchants themselves have in the past done their very best to regulate the supply, the question before us and the country now to decide is, has our product realised its full value, and has the fishermen got his full value for his catch. These are the main points that weigh with me in voting for these resolutions. In the first place the merchants themselves have realised from time to time that it was necessary to regulate the supply and necessary to see that they get full value for their products and for that purpose they have combined.

In 1901 an Exporters' Association was formed, of which I was secretary. That association composed all the merchants of Water Street, and one of the first jobs I got as a lawyer was to draw a contract by which we could make the fish buyers in Brazil pay cash against documents. I know that this association did not last. Composed in that association were firms such as Bowring Brothers, Goodridge & Sons, Job Brothers, Baine Johnstone & Co., Tessier's and the late Robert Thorburn, and in fact all the big fish buyers on Water Street. Each one of them deposited with me $1,000 that they would stick to the prices that they named for their fish.

The first one to break that agreement was Bowring Brothers, who were fined $1,000. The matter went before the Supreme Court with the result that they had to pay. When I was secretary of that association the merchants tried every means in their power to control the price of fish to Brazil. I think that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries with the help of the advisory board will put the Brazil market price on the firm and sound basis that those gentlemen were trying to put it on nineteen years ago. The nafter that association was broken up, they formed another one, and realising that not only was it necessary that they should have protection as regards the price of fish, but it was necessary that their affairs should be controlled as well in the agreement that they had drafted. Not later than the 16th of January, 1919, they came to agreement and they formed rules and regulations themselves. In order to show you that their claim now that their private interests should not be controlled by a half dozen people, I shall read you a copy of the agreement that was made by them a little over a year ago in which not alone were their private interests controlled, but that their whole individuality was controlled as well; and in binding themselves to carry that agreement into effect they realized the very thing that the government has realised. At that time Sir John Crosbie was asked to form a committee to take charge of the matter in the interests of the trade. (Reads agreement.)

The resolutions now before the chair only provide machinery for the forming of regulations, which must be made in the interest of the trade and the merchants themselves. Still it has been argued here that ti is vicious to allow seven men, including merchants and exporters, to get together and control all the interests, private and individual, of all the other merchants in the light of the following article. (Quotes Section 1 of agreement).

Then we are told that we should not fix the price and that men should go out into the market themselves and get the best price they can for their fish. Here is another part of their agreement. (Quotes Section 6 of agreement).

Is not that a complete answer in their own words to any argument that it is inadvisable to control or fixe the price of fish. Then again listen to the next article. (Quotes Section 8 of agreement).

They wound up the agreement with

the last clause, which put into the hands of their committee the sole control for the regulation of supply so that they might get the best price for their article. Now, in the light of an agreement of that sort, can it be said that we are trying to do anything extraordinary. I das down at a meeting of the Board of Trade in January or February last and I heard Sir John Crosbie say there that he thought that at certain times rules and regulations were necessary, but that it was hard from keeping those who signed from kicking over the traces. Realising now that the government has made it impossible for them to kick over the traces, as a result I know that a half a million dollars has been saved to the west coast fish exporters by the innovation of the new regulations. I want to point out that the rules and regulations for the sale of codfish and for the disposal of codfish are not unknown in Newfoundland and are not unknown on Water Street, but it must be remembered, sir, that this bill is purely and simply an experiment. I agree with what the hon. leader of the opposition said this afternoon, that there are big powers being put into the hands of the Governor-in-Council, but I can assure him that the members of the Executive Council, in their deliberations, will be guided by everything that common sense will dictate and by everything that will be for the best advantage of the community, because as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries said himself, the regulations are going to be tried out here, and if they do not work out satisfactory we shall hear about it. Then again all are licensed exporters of fish on the board.

So far as the fish exporters board is concerned, I should imagine that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is going to have it difficult to get that board to work at all.

Because though it is not the main reason I mentioned first it is going to be a labor of love for which they are not going to be paid for and they will undoubtedly come in for wholesale criticism and perhaps abuse. The late advisory board did excellent work and I think they deserved generally and from the community as a whole an expression of sincere thanks for the very useful work they put in.

And sir, I support these resolutions and I want to say this, that when I was canvassing in the district of Fortune Bay I told my constituents there that while we would do our best to check profiteering we would not likely prove very sucecssful because while it may be possible to stop men from overcharging here in Newfoundland it is absolutely impossible to cut down the prices of articles manufactured in other countries. The people here have to charge enough to pay them for their trouble and therefore I whole-heartedly support these resolutions. If we have to pay tremendous prices for the articles the business sections have imported we must realise the cost of production elsewhere, and every fisherman must realise that under these regulations they are going to get an opportunity to procure a decent price for their products. Their turn has come to prosper. Sir John Crosbie said that the merchants should not respect the regulations in selling fish and that they ought to be able to sell on their own terms, but I say they should not. If he thinks a man does not injure the country by underselling I say he is wrong. I want to say that if a man floods the markets with his cargoes of fish he is only bringing down the prices and it is just the same as putting your hand in the fisherman's pocket and taking his money. It is simply stealing other people's money. By seeking to discharge his products on the markets for a low and unwarranted price he is injuring the trade of

the community and should be prevented fro mdoing so. For the reason that these resolutions will, I am sure make it worth a man's while to catch fish, I support them.

MR. BENNETT:—Mr. Chairman, since I previously spoke on these resolutions, a clause has been inserted which alters the situation very considerably. I believed the hon. minister was sincere in trying to do all he could to make the bill as practical and as workable as possible, and I thought that in antagonizing the trade serious consequences might ensue and that the withdrawal of all power from them might bring about an industrial crisis. This clause alters the whole situation considerably and takes into account the suggestions that have been offered from this side of the house. For that reason sir, I withdraw my objections to the resolutions. Although there are still several clauses that are highly objectionable. But on the shoulders of the government is the resopnsibility.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Chairman, as I said this afternoon, I welcome the principle of the whole measure, although I thought that the suggestion of the leader of the opposition should be considered, and now that it has been adopted it is my intention to give my absolute support to every scetion of the bill. As I have already said, we should not look upon bills of such unusual importance as this from the political standpoint, nor have I ever in the past allowed myself to be swayed by such considerations on matters of this kind. If I am convinced that any measure, no matter who introduces it, is for the benefit of the masses, I shall support it, and I think if the day ever comes when any other consideration is sufficient to sway me, I hope that at least I shall have the courage to resign my seat. What L mean is, that if at any time any hon. member of this house could be induced to vote contrary to the dictates of his conscience for monetary considerations, the time has then come for him to hand in his resignation.

As I have intimated, I am now prepared to give these resolutions my absolute support, and as the hon. member for Burin, Mr. Cheeseman, is prepared to stand or fall by them, so am I, and if any of those whom I have the honor to represent in this house should suffer because of the enforcement of this measure, I am satisfied to take my share of the responsibility which my support of it entails, but I anticipate no such results, as I have the fullest confidence that the interests of each and every individual concerned will be safeguarded, and I think that if this measure is put into proper execution and if properly engineered, it will give the common toiler a better opportunity then he ever had before.

I wis hto reiterate sir, the intention I have already announced and I want to add that I accept the bill in its entirety, and by my vote I am prepared to stand or fall.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on this matter. I thought at first that I wouldn't speak on the matter at all, but I probably know as much about the fish question as a good many who have already spoken. I always try to tell the truth. I don't think I ever split a lie, and I guess that is about as many fish as Mr. Foote split. After listening to Mr. Coaker's speech on the resolutions I feel that I have learnt a lot about fish, and especially about the export of fish. He has the interests of the country at heart. In replying to the speech from the throne I said I hope Mr. Coaker's visit abroad would bear fruit, and I believe he will do the right thing. When Mr. Fox was speaking the Prime Minister told Mr. Coaker not to answer him back or he would be talking all night. Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to

assure him that I am not going to talk all night. I am going to support the bill before the house.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that in view of the suggestions made by the hon. members of the opposition, we contemplate inserting the following section after section four, as an amendment:

"A meeting of all exporters of codfish shall be convened by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries during the first week in September in each year to consider and discuss with the Codfish Regulations Board all matters relating to the exportation of codfish for the ensuing season. Such meetings shall be held at St. John's and two weeks' notice shall be given."

We insert this to meet the suggestions of friends of the bill on the other side of the house and it will mean that during the first week of September a meeting, of which two weeks' notice will be given for the benefit of outport exporters, will be held here in the city at which all matters relating to the exportation of fish will be discussed. I believe that the hon. members of the opposition are agreeable to support the resolutions before the house now that this section has been inserted and it will be a pleasure to me and I am sure it will be appreciated by the whole country, that this measure has been passed unanimously.

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 to regulate the Exportation of Salt Codfish" was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the house resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider the bill entitled "An Act to Check Profiteering."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs 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 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, the 25th inst., at three of the clock in the afternoon.

Mr. Fox gave notice of question.

The house then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, May 25th, 1920.

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

MR. ABBOTT:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Princeton, B.B., asking that a postal and telegraph office be placed at Princeton, near the railway station. They also ask that Summerville be connected by telephone with Southern Bay. This petition is signed by fifty or sixty of the inhabitants, and as I think it is a necessity, I give it my hearty support. I ask that this petition be referred to the department to which it relates, and that the government give it due consideration. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the electors of Summerville have petitioned the government three or four times for telephone connection with Southern Bay, but all to no avail. I hope the petitioners' request now will be aceded to.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Speaker, on your behalf, and at your request, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Carbonear against any modification of the Prohibition Act.

MR. ABBOTT:—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from Stock Cove, and Knight's Cove, asking that these two places be connected with King's Cove by telephone. The petitioners also ask that a canal be cut to a pond near the beach at Stock Cove which would serve for the protection of fishing boats in that locality. I ask that this petition be referred to the department to whic hit relates and that it be given due consideration.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Brigus, George's Town, against any modification of the Prohibition Act. They desire that the regulations be made more stringent. It is signed by sixty or seventy of the inhabitants. I wish also to present a similar one from the inhabitants of Bareneed, Port de Grave. They don't want any modification of the act. They want to see it enforced more stringently.

DR. JONES:—I beg leave to present a series of petitions from the inhabitants of Horse Cove, against any modification of the Prohibition Act.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from about fifty of the fishermen of King's Cove, Fermeuse, asking for a public wharf for that place, and I also wish to present a petition from Witless Bay, signed by two hundred of the inhabitants, asking that a grant be allowed them to repair breakwater.

MR. HIBBS:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Island Harbor, in Fogo District, asking for telegraphic or telephone communication with the town of Fogo. The people of Island Harbor are isolated. It is a distance of about nine miles from Fogo, and in order to reach there you have to cross Hare Bay, and as in certain seasons of the year it is almost impossible to cross, the people have to go by a circuitous route. If these people had telephone communication with Fogo it would save a lot of trouble and time and would serve their interests greatly. I ask that this petition be referred to the department to which it relates, and that it be given due consideration.

I also wish to present a petition from Victoria, asking for two hundred dollars to construct a road to Dog Bay. There is just now a foot path, and as it is very marshy and boggy ground it will be difficult to construct a road. I think that the importance of the place justifies this sum, and I have great pleasure in supporting this petition.

MR. ABBOTT:—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from Stark Cove, and Knight's Cove, that these two places be connected with King's Cove by telephone. I ask that this petition be referred to the department to which it relates and that it be given due consideration.

Petitions were presented by Sir J. C. Crosbie from Port de Grave, re prohibition; Sir J. C. Crosbie from Bareneed, re prohibition; Dr. Jones from Gasters, re prohibition; Mr. Abbott from Princeton, re postal service; Sir M. P. Cashin from King's Cove re public wharf; Sir M. P. Cashin from Witless Bay, re breakwater; Mr. Small from Burgeo, re prohibition; Mr. Hibbs, from Inland Harbor, re telephone; Mr. Hibbs from Victoria, re road; Hon. Minister of Justice for Mr. Speaker, from Carbonear, re prohibition; Mr. Abbott from Stock Cove, re telephone.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Montreal Trust Company"

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

Mr. Fox asked the Hon. the Prime Minister what policy the government has under review in reference to the establishment of a Reformatory or House of Correction for juvenile offenders. It is the intention of the government to establish such an institution. If so, when and where? If not, why not?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:— In answer to the question of the hon. member for St. John's East in reference to a reformatory, I would say that the matter of a reformatory is but one, and perhaps a minor item, in the general program of social service welfare which the government has had under consideration for some months. Some years ago when Attorney General, I gave considerable thought to the question of the corelation of legislation in the eastern provinces of Canada and Newfoundland so as to make it possible to have delinquent girls transferred from Newfoundland to some suitable reformatory in Eastern Canada and so save Newfoundland the very great expense incidental to the erection and maintenance of a reformatory for certain classes of female juvenile offenders. The matter does not appear to have received any consideration, however, after I resigned from the Department of Justice, but that program, together with a program in relation to a reformatory for boys has been submitted as two of the items discussed with the government during the past few months by the Social Service Council. A committee of the executive government also had the pleasure of receiving a deputation from a representative body of gentlemen consisting of the Rev. Dr. Jones, the nominee of the Lord Bishop of Newfoundland; Rev. Fr. Renouf, the nominee of His Grace the Archbishop of St. John's, an dthe Rev. D. B. Hemmeon, the nominee of the President of the Methodist Conference of Newfoundland, and these gentlemen laid before the committee of council their lives with respect to certain social service problems which they felt should be dealt with by the government. It included within its scope both matters above referred to, and a number of other problems, covering a juvenile court and special legislation to give the police additional authority in certain matters. In addition to these individual items outlined above, the government has been approached in the matter of child welfare, special nursing and medical facilities in the outports, and sundry other items which, if undertaken, would make a very extensive and important social service program. The whole matter has for some time past been receiving the careful consideration of committee of council, and such steps as the government feels it is practicable to take at this session of the legislature towards the carrying out of that program will be undertaken. In the matter of a reformatory for boys it is not proposed to ask a vote for such a purpose at this session of the legislature.

The government feels that while it is bearing the burden of the large expenditure entailed in connection with the necessary work for the civil re-establishment of returned soldiers and sailors, it is impracticable for it to divert any large expenditures in the particular direction indicated by my honorable friend in this question. I can assure the house, however, that the government is fully alive to the importance of the problems which have been presented to them both by the Social Service Council and the Women's Patriotic Association and the special deputation, the personnel of which I have already indicated, and proposed to devote its energies to the carrying out of this

program, having due regard to the local conditions and the imperative need for economy in the public service.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:— With reference to Sir M. P. Cashin's question re the royal commission, I make the following statement: From the beginning the two judges who had been requested by His Excellency the Governor to serve on the royal commission pointed out that they ought not to be asked to deal with any question of law. His Excellency the Governor did not, however, understand that they had no wish to find upon the facts, though the judges believed they had endeavored to make this clear to him. No draft was submitted to the judges and it was not suggested that the Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Kent were responsible for the delay in issuing this commission except so far as there was a misunderstanding as to their functions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 157 of the Consolidated Statutes of Nfld. (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Fire Patrol,'" 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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the house resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to amend 'The Income War Tax Act, 1918.'"

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The chairman from the committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the bill without amendment.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the house resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider the bill entitled "An Act to Check Profiteering."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed th echair.

The chairman from the committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the bill with some amendment.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the bill entitled "An Act to amend the Consolidated Statutes of Nfld. (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Encouragement of Agriculture,'" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole house on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting Certificates of Masters and Mates" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole house on to-morrow.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:— Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this bill, in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I may say that there are a large number of masters and mates who have been unable to obtain certificates of competency by reason of the war, as will be seen in the preamble. This is to provide that they will be able to get certificates until the end of this year. The board appointed under this act will only be able to remain in existence until the first of January of the coming

year. The house will notice that the board will comprise the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Harbor Master and Sir John Crosbie, though it will not mean that Sir John will have to go back to Port de Grave for re-election.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the issue of Certain Debenture Bonds of the Colony," was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole house on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act to Regulate the Exportation of Salt Codfish," was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole house on to-morrow.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a bill to amend Cap. X of 9 and 10 George V, respecting existing tenancies and the ejectment therefrom.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a bill, entitled "An Act respecting Licenses to Cut Hard-wood."

Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the house into a committee of the whole to consider certain resolutions on the subject of the postal and telegraph services.

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

The house then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, May 26th, 1920.

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

Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs tabled report of the Postmaster General for year ended June 30th, 1919.

MR. SINNOTT:—Mr. Speaker, I have been requested by the residents of Branch, St. Bride's and Cape Shore to ask the government to build a motor road to connect these places with the railroad at Placentia. Owing to the geographical position of that section of the coast line, extending from Branch to Placentia, these people are isolated, and although paying a large share of the taxes, are without steam or rail communication. As there is no harbor from North Harbor in St. Mary's Bay to Placentia, a steamer cannot call, except in fine weather, and on account of those drawbacks the people are put to very great loss, hardships and inconveniences. I know the section in question very well, having had personal knowledge of it all my life, and I can truthfully say that I don't know of any people neglected to such an extent as those of Branch and Cape Shore. Not because they do not deserve better treatment, because they do. They are a hard-working, honest and industrious, farming and fishing people, making a comfortable living in spite of the way they have been neglected by all governments—from the days of the first responsible government down to the present day. All are equally guilty for the disgraceful neglect of this imporant section of our Dominion.

For want of this road these people are obliged to sell the fruits of their toil, both land and sea, much less than in other parts of the country, and it is this very reason that I am here to-day, not to beg but to demand that this road be built, and that without further delay. Whilst I have the honor to represent the important district of Placentia and St. Mary's, anything of benefit to the people in general, and to the fishermen in particular, shall always have my earnest support. The road in question will not alone serve those living

along the shore, but the hundreds of others who make Cape St. Mary's and other points nearby their headquarters during the fishing season.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the fishermen from the Drook to Rushoon can always count on my looking after their interests at all times. Cape St. Mary's is, as you know, one of the greatest fishing grounds in the Dominion. Perhaps there is more revenue paid from those grounds than from any other, and it is not a blot on us to have the greatest asset the Dominion possesses, namely, the fishermen, so treated?

I know it will surprise hon. members of this house to hear that to my personal knowledge last year the ridiculous prices of $8 and $9 were paid on this coast for fish, whereas people in other parts of the Dominion received $12 per qtl. I am very sorry to state that this is a fact, which can be very easily proven, and it is certainly a conditio nof affairs that I am not going to stand for.

Yes sir, the fisherman's lot is a hard one. With profiteering grinding him down on the one hand, and $8 for fish on the other, how is he going to pay his bills and support a family? Just think of such a state of serfdom for a people who in their line of work have no superiors in the world. It is unthinkable that men who are such an asset to the country should be treated so badly.

It is time to cry halt. Give them fair play. Put them on an equal footing with others, and the way to do this is to build the road in question. With a good motor road they can take their fish to Placentia for shipment anywhere, and thus get as much for their products as anyone else. This road will also have another great advantage in the incentive it will give to farming and cattle-raising, and the inducements it will offer to hundreds of families to settle down along the route.

It is generally conceded that Cape Shore is second to none as an agricultural district, and in this section is the real independent fisherman-farmer to be found. In no other part of our island home is cattle-raising carried on to such an extent. I don't know of anywhere else in the Dominion that one can meet with herds of 50 heads being driven to market and this sight is common along Cape Shore. When such is possible under present conditions, what may be expected when this section comes into its own and when it gets roads equal to other parts of the country. The cattle-raising and farming possibilities there are so great and such an asset to the country as would justify the expenditure of ten times the amount necessary to build this road.

The road in question will be about 20 miles in length, passing through the best agricultural lands in the Dominion. Along the proposed route are to be found thousands of acres of land suitable for grazing for immense numbers of cattle and sheep, the value of which to the exchequer is not easily estimated. All this can be done for the cost of about one mile of railway. I cannot understand why it has not been done long ago. It is going to be a paying proposition for the government. The people deserve it and it would be a small recognition of the many who answered the call of king and country from that section. Branch, St. Bride's and Cape Shore generally were well represented in the great world war, where they did their part in keeping the old flag flying, and the least they deserve from us is white treatment.

I would respectfully ask that a competent engineer be sent at once to locate this road, so as it can be begun immediately. It is my intention to see this great public benefit constructed. After all it is their own money. They are drawing it from the waters around Cape St. Mary's. The fishermen are

the ones we must stand by. In conclusion I trust:

"That luck may be theirs from spring
to fall,
And Cape St. Mary's pay for all."

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Speaker, I have very much pleasure in supporting the petition presented by my colleague. This is not the first occasion that this house has been petitioned for a road in that particular section. I do not know whether railway problems have been occupying the attention of the government or not, but, as has been stated, the building of one mile of railroad would be the means of saving an immense lot of money for these people, who would be able to get more for their products when marketing same. I hope that if the government proposes to do any railway extension in the near future that they will consider the voting of a sufficient amount of money to build the mile of railway referred to. I notice that the people in the outlying settlements of St. John's West have no difficulty in getting their products to the city and if we had a similar road it would be the means of the saving of a considerable lot of money. I commend this petition to the sympathetic consideration of the government.

MINISTER OF SHIPPING:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a number of petitions from the district of Bay de Verde, as follows: From Western Bay North and Upper Small Point on the subject of roads; another from Freshwater on the subject of a grant for repairs to a wharf; also another from Ochre Pit Cove on the same subject. These petitions are largely signed and the amounts asked for are small in comparison to the work to be done, and I sincerely hope that the government will see its way clear to grant the sums asked for in these requests.

HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—I ask leave to present petitions from Grand Falls and Pilley's Island on the subject of prohibition. These petitions are against any modification of the act. They rather ask for greater stringency in the enforcement of it. It is plain a great many favor a modification and say that a great many evils such as dope, moonshine and smuggling can be laid at the door of prohibition. I rather think the contrary, and the trouble is with those who have made up their minds to get spirits at any cost even if they break the act.

I think a member on the opposition side some time ago in speaking to the address in reply mentioned the troubles that arise in the law courts and said that matters under the prohibition act are far worse than before i twas passed. I think the gentleman was once connected with the legal profession, I went to the trouble to get the figures of the arrests for drunkenness from the Inspector of Constabulary. These figures show a great difference since the passing of the prohibition act and before its passing. There is a big difference and in fact the total arrests for dope and drunenness included since the passing of the act do not come up to those for the last year liquor was sold.

In the year 1916 the number of arrests for drunkenness in St. John's was six hundred and eighteen, and for the three years following seventeen, eighteen and nineteen, the total number of arrests amounted to four hundred and ten. These show that there is a great difference in the troubles brought before the courts of law now and before the passing of the act.

I heartily endorse the prayer of the petitions and particularly with regard to the more stringent enforcement of the law, and trust that those entrusted with the enforcement of the act, if delinquent in their duties, will be handled without gloves. I ask that these peti-

tions be received and referred to the department of the Colonial Secretary and hope that they will receive the consideration they merit.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—I ask leave to present some petitions from the residents of St. John's East asking that there be a modificatio nof the prohibition act. I hope and trust the request of those petitions will be granted. The last speaker was telling us about the difference of arrests for drunkenness before the passing of the act and since its enforcement. I might say in reply to the Hon. Minister of Public Works that before the passing of the act if a man staggered on the street at all the policeman had him arrested, but now since the prohibition was enforced a great many persons who are very drunk are missed altogether, or in other words overlooked. I have great pleasure in supporting the prayer of these petitions and ask that they be referred to the department to which they relate.

CAPTAIN JONES:—I ask leave to present petitions from the residents of Springdale, Little Bay Island, Long Island, Twillingate district, asking that there be no modification of the Prohibition Act. I hope and trust that the act will be enforced and ask to have them referred to the proper authorities and hope they will receive the consideration they deserve.

HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—If I am not out of order I might say in reply to the hon. member for St. John's East that the policemen also happened to miss certain parties before the passing of the Prohibition Act. I remember well a certain occasion on my way home from the House of Assembly I met a man in a horrible condition, his face covered with blood and his clothes as if he had been rolling in a pig pen, drunk and incapable to the last degree, rolling about the streets. There was no one to look after him so to save his life I played the part of the Good Samaritan, spending about an hour in getting him to his home. This apparently is one of the cases the policemen happened to miss.

HON. MINISTER O FJUSTICE:—I ask leave to present a petition this afternoon which is one of more than ordinary importance. It is from the owners of motor cars and it is signed by over one hundred of them. They ask, although it is somewhat unusual, that a higher tax be placed upon motor cars by increasing the present rate so that the proposed rate would mean that on a car of the type of a Ford or Chevrolet, the tax would be about thirty-five dollars per year; on a car say of the type of the Buick or the Chalmers, it would be about fifty dollars and on the larger type of car the tax would be seventy-five dollars per year. They ask that the revenue derived from these taxes be given to a commission appointed by the Motor Association, a body properly incorporated under the laws of Newfoundland, of the Minister of Public Works will be the chairman. This commission will purchase road-making machinery to build and keep up the roads and will see that they are kept in fit condition. These roads are the ones around St. John's and in the vicinity of Conception Bay. They are prepared and willing to assist in the improvements of the roads and they need funds to defray the cost of the repairs, and as they ask here they are prepared to tax themselves, and they also ask that the government will grant them out of the road grant an amount equal to fifty per cent. of the amount they are prepared to tax themselves.

In doing this work the Motor Association is only doing what has been done, but somewhat more extensively, in other countries, and something which will benefit everybody. The necessity for the improvement of roads has not

as yet met with very much consideration in Newfoundland and I would like to point out to the house that in Ontario the provincial government set aside three million dollars to be used in five years for the improvement of highways, and this fund was made up from taxes taken from vehicles of every description under the motor car act. The same thing happened in Prince Edward's Island, which up to a short time ago prohibited motor cars and legislation was introduced to take advantage of the grant of the federal government to improve roads. In British Columbia, Hon. John King, Minister of Public Works, announced that the sum of eight million dollars would be spent in the next three to five years in road building and improvement.

I do not think that in the past our system of improvement and repair of the public roads has been a success. It has failed because of various reasons, and I think all who sit in this house know that one of the chief reasons is that it has not been gone about in a businesslike manner. In recent years the ordinary man who works on the roads does not do his work in a satisfactory manner because of the simple reason that the amount voted for his work is not attractive. And I think the time has come that if we are to get the best benefit and advantage from our roads the work to some extent ought to be handed over to the Motor Association who will keep up and maintain the public highways, and it will see that the work is done properly and will not be influenced by politics.

I see by The Evening Herald of this evening that the Canadian government has voted $50,000,000 for the improvement of a single road from Halifax to Vancouver, and the United States government has voted $50,000,000 for the improvement of roads. I feel sure that the house will grant the prayer of this petition, and give it hearty support.

HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—Mr. Speaker, while subject of the petition presented by the Minister of Justice is being discussed, I would like to have a word to say on the matter. As far as I can judge from information received, and from my own observation, the ordinary wooden bridges usually built on outport roads are not able to stand the traffic of motor cars, as they are much heavier than the ordinary horse and cart, and a bridge suitable for ordinary use will not stand the wear and tear caused by motor cars. To deal with this matter it would be necessary to introduce the construction of concrete bridges which, I understand, are already being introduced in St. John's East. A great many complaints are continually coming in to the Public Works Department in regard to rotton bridges particularly from Harbor Main, and has led me to the conclusion that in the allocation of public moneys in that district last fall, the bridges must have been entirely neglected, and apparently if any work was done for the money it must have been done on private roads ,and not on the main line.

If the motor cars are come to stay it will be introduced similar to those embodied in the petition now presented. I may say at the same time that I see no reason why this work cannot be done under the supervision of the public works department, even if it does involve the employment of an expert foreman to supervise the work. Whatever may be done in this direction it would be necessary to remember that nothing should be attempted which would rob the outport districts of the necessary grants which they must have in order to have a road fit even to walk over.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting

this petition. I quite agree with the hon. minister regarding the condition of our roads. When you take the large number of motor cars in the city, and those that will be here in the next one or two years, we must agree that the roads should be in a better condition. There are now nearly 500 cars in the city. Place their average value at $2,000 each, and the duty practically 50 per cent., the owners pay into the revenue of the country about a half million dollars. Then there is the enormous amount of repair work done, giving a large amount of labor to a number of people. There should be an increased motor tax. I strongly favor such a petition. The motor owner shall pay a higher tax, but he should get something in return in the form of good roads. Take from here to Carbonear. There is a large number of motorists that use that road, although it is entirely unsafe to ride over now. If you put a tax of $50.00 on every car that will mean about $30,000, but that is not sufficient to put the roads in good condition. There are other other sections that would be used by motorists if the roads were fit to use. It would mean that those sections would be rapidly built up. Hotels would be built, and tourists would again patronize those sections and put considerable money in the revenue of the country, besides leaving money in every section visited. I would go further than that petition.

I see no reason why it could not be made 100 per cent. instead of 50 per cent. I would be in favor of turning over the handling of road moneys in my district to a motor association that would undertake the proper expenditure of the money and put the roads in good condition. When we consider the enormous cost of labor and of road building we will realize that the petitioners made a very modest request. I agree with you that machinery should be brought down here and paid for by the government.

We are not getting a proper value for the money expended on the roads. I believe that if we build good roads around Conception Bay it will open up an industry not now in existence. The increase asked is altogether too modest. There is no reason why it should not be doubled. The matter of the expenditure of the road moneys should be taken up with the members with a view to co-operating with the Motor Association. $30,000 is not enough. If the government would pue another $30,000 with that it would put good roads all around to Trinity Bay. We receive more revenue from motor cars than we did from liquor in the past. It is giving us a revenue of over a half million dollars. I have much pleasure in supporting the petition. I hope it will be made 100 per cent. instead of 50 per cent.

DR. JONES:—Mr. Speaker, I have had some little experience in motor driving and I also know something about the Hr. Main roads. Hr. Main has come in for a great deal of censure from the Minister of Public Works, but you will admit sir, that you cannot get very far down the shore, going from St. John's around the bay without passing through Hr. Main district, and I think that any requests coming in from there for repairs are fully justified. On Sunday and Monday there were no less than two hundred motor cars passed through there, and with such traffic as that the demand for repairs must of necessity be very great.

I am in full accord with the idea that something be done to build roads that will be capable of meeting the increasing requirements of the time because the grant at present is practically the same as it was thirty or forty years ago when there was nothing but a few horses and cars or carriages using the roads, and it is but reason-

able to suppose that the provision made for bridges now should be very much greater.

There is a bridge going into Avondale that is the longest on the line between St. John's to Carbonear, and this bridge in itself costs an immense amount to keep in repair. It has in my time been rebuilt three times and is now in a very dangerous condition, and in my opinion it should be replaced by a concrete structure. It is not necessary to have a bridge there as long as this one as there is very little water there and the purpose could just as well be served by concrete sections and culverts.

Ibelieve that the Motor Association is an ideal body to take charge of our roads and bridges, but I do not mean that they should have entire control but should act in conjunction with a board appointed by the government. They know best the requirements of the highways and would devise the best means of attending to them. The ordinary person driving around the bay would imagine the roads were fairly good, but let him get in a car that cost a couple of thousand dollars and drive over that road and he will soon discover that it is far from good and the car will show it too. From past experience I know that the government itself is not capable of giving proper attention to the roads of the country and the matter should be placed in the hands of a proper body. I look for good results if the government gives this petition the consideration it deserves.

There are now a couple hundred bridges on the road around Conception Bay and every year these require to be repaired because of the manner in which they are torn up by floods and heavy frosts and particularly all of these are now in a dangerous condition. Apart from this road is not altogether so bad and with a proper expenditure it could be put in good condition.

As Sir Michael Cashin has pointed out, good roads are an asset to any country, and as there are many pretty spots in various sections along the road, and a good motor road from Holyrood to Salmonier, thence to Colinet, to Whitbourne and Brigus and back to St. John's would make an ideal trip. Then one from Carbonear around Trinity Bay and from New Harbor to Whitbourne is another. If we had good roads through those places the tourist traffic would be very great and benefit the whole country. There are already roads through those sections and they need only to be widened and improved to make them good motor roads for all kinds of traffic. I heartily support this movement to make good roads and trust it will receive the favorable consideration of the government.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS:—Mr. Speaker, the ambition of the petitioners to have better motor roads for the suburbs of St. John's and around Conception Bay is most praiseworthy, and the proposition to tax the owners of motor cars for this purpose will meet with general approval. It is generally recognized that motor cars are very destructive to the roads and bridges over which they run for any considerable time. The motorists should, in justice to their less fortunate neighbors who have no cars, provide funds to keep such roads in a state of repair. I cannot support that section of the petition which asks this legislature for a sum of money, without certain reservations or conditions, for after all any money that would be voted in this way must come out of the public as a whole, and if the government votes money to help make better roads for motorists we must remember the pressing needs of the extern settlements, the real producers of the country, who have from time to time

wharves damaged, slips washed away and bridges needing attention in order that they might be able to carry on their work. Those are the people who produce the wealth of the country and they should have the first consideration.

When this or any other government can afford to give to a Motor Association fifty to sixty thousand dollars to make good roads and vote an equivalent amount to the extern settlements for the needs of the fishermen, I will say alright, go ahead! But unless it is made apparent to me that the government can allocate sufficient moneys to give the fishermen and producers of the country the roads, bridges, wharves, breakwaters and slips they so badly need to assist them in producing the wealth of the country, I cannot support this petition. I feel that I should not give my support to anything that has the color of a luxury, when we have so many pressing appeals for money to assist the producers to get the wealth from the sea and land upon which the very existence of the country depends. That is the position I take with regard to this petition.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Speaker, I wish to support that petition for the reasons that have been stated by the Hon. Minister of Justice and by the hon. leader of the opposition. I would like to see the Motor Association with some governmental control so that the matter could be dealt with in a business-like way. The Motor Association could have control of motor traffic, with power to penalize those who do not conform to the laws. I certainly think that this is a very modest request. I had occasion a few days ago to motor to Harbor Grace. The condition of the roads is frightful. I never saw anything like it. It is an absolute disgrace. All the bridges are in tumbling down condition. I would like to ask the hon. minister if it would not be possible to give the Motor Association some legislative authority to deal with the matter.

MR. HIBBS:—Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two on this matter. Personally, I am much in favor of improving our public highways, but at the present time I do not see my way clear to give my support to this petition. I am heartily in accord with the idea of building better roads. It is a matter I have given much attention during recent years, and I would like to see a reasonable tax levied on all motor cars, but that the association should have control over the expenditure of this money is a matter that I shall oppose with all my power. To hand absolute control of the building of our main roads to any private concern, corporation or association is something which should never be done. What I would suggest is that a board be specially appointed to have control of all public highways. I notice the motor owners are willing to be taxed to build the roads they destroy. I am not surprised, for the government should tax them whether they like it or not. Our roads were never exceptionally good, but since they have had to stand the added wear of motor traffic they have been going from bad to worse, and the bridges which were never built to stand this kind of traffic have been found impossible to keep up, and only concrete abutments and culverts will give anything like satisfaction in standing the strain they will be subjected to. I believe we must have some big scheme if we are going to permanently improve our roads in a way that will enable them to meet the demands that will be made upon them in the future.

I can agree with Sir Michael Cashin that the government, if the money can be spared, should put dollar for dollar against that collected from motor taxes, and purchase labor-saving road

making machinery, but in my opinion the government should retain the ownership of same, and not allow any combination of men to usurp the functions belonging only to the Department of Public Works.

Although its members are a very desirable class as a whole, the motor owners are only human beings like ourselves, and cannot be expected to know more about road building than any other body of persons, and in fact not as much as the majority who do not own machines, and personally I think that instead of being looked upon as road makers they might be regarded more as road hogs. That is the name I would give, at least some of them. I have had some experience with some of these gentry, having lived the greater part of my time in the country, and I know what it is for a man to have to pull his horse off the road to the ditch in order to escape passing cars, the owners of which had very little regard for the rights of others.

But sir, to get down to the point, who are the Motor Association going to employ to do this proposed work? I suppose they will import men to take charge of it, not deeming Newfoundlanders capable of building roads. For their information I can give the names of at least three Newfoundlanders who are doing road building in Canada, and one who is doing the same work in the United States, and I am quite confident that we could find men to-day who could do the work as well or better than anyone we could get from outside. The Newfoundlanders has always been able to keep up the end of his plank wherever he went, and I know of some very competent men whose services could be secured under a properly constituted board. I am not speaking now of ordinary road boards, but we should have something like a public highways board, one member of which should be an engineer, another a representative of the Motor Association, together with a third competent man, and under such direction the work of road construction or repairs could be well carried out.

With regard to the suggestion of Mr. Fox, that the association should be allowed to regulate traffic, I think that such a step would be the most undesirable of all. Take the farmer for example, who has to come to town with his produce, and in many cases has to send his boy, or even his wife, for that is not unusual. Would he be quite safe in doing that if the Motor Association had the regulating of the traffic? Surely this class of man has some rights and is entitled to some consideration, and in that case I question if he could expect to receive any. As to speed, I understand there is such a thing as the speed law, but it is totally disregarded, and surely we could not hope to have any improvement if the motorists were allowed to make regulations to suit themselves.

In order to improve our roads, I would say import machinery by all means, and an engineer should be secured to give scientific advice, but the public works department should entirely control the work.

In Canada and the United States, and I believe in all other countries, the owners of motor vehicles are taxed in proportion to the power of their cars, and the money is used principally to rebuild and repair the highways over which those machines pass, but no association or club has ever been given power to expend such public funds or purchase and own machinery, as this work is performed by county councils and specially appointed commissions who are responsible to the minister of highways.

Such a proposition as that suggested in this petition is without a precedent in any country, and I do not for

a moment think that the government should even consider it here.

If the construction of our public streets and highways was handed over to this body, who themselves have in the main absolutely no experience, or even idea of road-building, it would be tantamount to an admission on the part of the government that it was incompetent of doing the work, and I do not think we have reached that stage yet.

Let us be big enough to copy from other countries, and place this work under the proper responsible department. It has been said that motorists were building roads in Canada. That is not so. I understand that a special boulevard is being constructed in Nova Scotia, but the main highways in use by the general public are not being built under the auspices of any association, but by the proper authorities.

The highways in Canada are under control of the minister of public highways and it is the same in all the provinces where boards usually consisting of five members have control of the roads. Only recently I have received some literature on this matter which I have not yet had time to read up, but which I should be glad to hand to any hon. member who would like to see it.

I have some more observations to make on this subject, but I shall reserve them till a bill is brought down to give effect to this matter. In the meantime I support the request for the fifty per cent., or even a hundred per cent. to augment the motor tax, if such a sum can be spared for the purpose, and I agree that the Motor Association should be represented on the board that expends this money, but to give such a body anything like control is a proposition that will certainly not receive my support.

The Hon. the Prime Minister gives notice of question.

The Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs gives notice of introduction of bill .

SIR J. C. CROSBIE:—Before adjourning may I ask the Prime Minister if he knows anything about the salt question.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—I will have the information to-morrow.

MR. HIGGINS:—I support it on the line that he suggests so far as my district is concerned. Down around Pouch Cove and Flatrock motor trucks are used largely for the transport of fish, and for the information of the Hon. Minister of Public Works, St. John's East during the past three years has initiated concrete bridges owing to the heavy freighting of fish down and up from these settlements because the aristocratic or supposed aristocratic and democratic traffic could not stand the strain that was being brought to bear upon them. It has been found in practice that concrete bridges in the district of St. John's East are most beneficial and today we have, I think, something like twelve of them down there. Five or six of these are huge and immense structures. One I think has been built on Quidi Vidi Road and on Torbay Road three or four were placed. In Torbay itself, where no luxury cars are driven, and where a concrete bridge has been constructed, you will find that it is used practically for fish hauling. Another way in which these bridges have been proved beneficial is that when wooden structures were there the road was often completely tied up, but the concrete bridge has eliminated the possibility of this ever happening again. I support the principle of this bill for broader reasons. I think I understand that the petition submitted requires no matter of conflict methods of expenditure but rather as I take it that they be given the benefit of the allocation that the improvement of these roads would require. I think that if around Concep-

tion Bay good highways were built they would be of great benefit not only to car owners but to the whole community. I agree that we ought not undertake to advance to any section of the people the entire control of the roads.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—I rise to support the petition presented and in doing so I might say that I think that if some improvements were made in this direction great advantage would be given to the people and, as already pointed out by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, a great number of cars will come into the Colony if good roads are available.

Now I want to reply to a statement made a few minutes ago by the hon. member for Fogo when he classed all motor drivers "road hogs."

MR. HIBBS:—I didn't classify all.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—What about your friend, Mr. Coaker. Did you class him a road hog?

MR. HIBBS:—He can't drive a car.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—I'd advise him not to learn.

MR. HIBBS:—I wouldn't class him a road hog.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—I'm afraid I doubt you. Mr. Hibbs says that he knows of Newfoundlanders who are building roads in Canada, but, the machinery and the proper expenditure is available there. But in this country we don't even get the value of the expenditure.

MR. WALSH—Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to listen to the debate this afternoon as it shows good spirit in trying to co-operate with the government, and I realize that the time has come when we should find some means of improving the conditions that now exist so far as the roads of this country are concerned. It is a well known fact that the elected road boards should get the public money for the improvement and upkeep of these roads but it would be found impracticable to give the control of these boards to the association. If the department of public works and the Motor Association were to co-operate, I would have very great faith in what would result. But if the Motor Association were given control the sections around St. John's would be well looked after and the remote parts of the Island would get no assistance whatever. I would like the government to seriously consider this.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER—Mr. Speaker, this petition from the Motor Association relating to the improvement of the public highways of the colony is one well worthy of the careful consideration of the house. I appreciate the fact that it is a matter of importance to motorists, but the advantage which motorists derive from our highways is but a small proportion of the value of the highways to the country. The very great importance of good roads is fully recognized in all civilized countries. Nor is this merely modern thought. The highways of the Roman Empire of the days of Julius Caesar were world landmarks in the matter good road construction. Great Britain, the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada annually spend a huge sum of money to provide efficient road service to the public. During recent years the United States government and the government of the Dominion of Canada have made appropriations in the many millions for road construction. Newfoundland can never hope to be a country of great highways, just as Newfoundland can never hope to be a great wheat-producing country. The rugged nature of the country itself and the fact that our population live on the seacoast necessarily mean that traffic by sea rather than inland will for many years to come be the most important factor in the development

of the trade of the country. Under local conditions the motor-boat takes the place of the motor-car. It is nevertheless important that the past policy of wastefulness in connection with the expenditure of good moneys be abandoned and that the policy of the new administration to secure value in the expenditure of road moneys and to make additional appropriations for main line roads should be immediately put into effect. Some years ago a number of motorists personally subscribed a considerable sum of money and expended it in the improvement of the roads from St. John's to Topsail. Very much better value was secured for the expenditure of private moneys than is ordinarily secured for the expenditure of public road moneys. Competent road foremen were employed, and the operations were conducted on a practical business basis, with the result that the entire section of the public who use that road have for some years past benefited by the activities of the motorists who subscribed their own funds to add to work carried on under their supervision.

For some time the special tax paid by motorists as a license fee for their cars has been appropriated one-half to the St. John's Municipal Council and one-half for the improvement of roads used by motorists. It is difficult to know what the Municipal Council has done with the half of the tax held by them. Everybody knows that the section within the city limits of the roads leading out of town have been permitted by the city council to remain in an abominably unsatisfactory condition. Take, for instance the LeMarchant-Cornwall Avenue road leading to Topsail. One does not get a decent stretch of road until one gets outside the city limits. The traveller then gets within the jurisdiction of the St. John's West road inspector, Mr. Bambrick, and the roads are on the whole reasonably satisfactory. The other half of the motor tax is divided up and forms part ot the road grants of the districts of St. John's East, St. John's West, Ferryland, Harbour Main, Harbor Grace and other sections of the Peninsula of Avalon where motor cars are most frequently used. These moneys, however, have gone into the general road grants, and in the past not more than fifty per cent. value has been secured therefor. The whole matter of the improvement of roads, not merely from the standpoint of increased grants but from the standpoint of increased value for the money expended because of competent direction is the policy of this administration. The exact opposite was the policy of the late administration. It is quite probable that not more than ten per cent. value was secured by the Colony for the expenditure of approximately half a million dollars by the late government during the months of September and October of last year. The huge amount of money expended under the authority of the department of public works when the now notorious Woodford was minister of that department was expended purely for partizan political purposes. Its distribution was a public scandal, and, as I have already said, the Colony did not get more than ten per cent. value for it

The motorists in their petition suggest that they should be submitted to an increased tax and that that tax should be applied to the improvement and repair of roads used by motorists. There can be no possible objection to accepting the views of the members of the Motor Association and placing upon all motor cars an additional tax to be applied for the improvement of roads used by motorists. The motorists also ask that a reasonable sum of money be allocated annually as a

special appropriation for roads used by motorists. This is a reasonable request. On importation into the Colony the motor cars pay a tax of approximately forty-five per cent. on the cost of the car. Motor car tires, accessories and supplies pay a similarly heavy tax. The motorist pays a tax of six cents per gallon on every gallon of gasolene consumed. There is no tax on gasolene for use in connection with the fishery. The motorist raises no objection to paying this substantial tax, whether the car be used for pleasure purposes or whether it be used for business purposes such as the use of motor cars by medical men and others, and the use of motor trucks. In addition to these heavy taxes upon motor cars and gasolene used by them, the motorist contributes very largely to the revenue by the employment of drivers whose annual salaries amount to a very large sum, a driver's salary ranging from $20.00 to $30.00 per week. The cost of the upkeep and repair means the existence of many garages, with the consequent considerable employment of labor. It is estimated that the revenue on motor cars, tires and parts during the last fiscal year was approximately $104,748.00. It is also estimated that the import tax paid upon motor cars during the past few years is considerabl in excess of half a million dollars. I consequently feel that the Colony might very reasonably allocate annually a small proportion of the taxes collected annually on motor cars and apply that money to the opening up of new roads and the improvement and repair of existing roads. The new roads which would be opened up would not be opened up would not be opened up for the benefit of motorists as motor roads. They would be opened up in the interests of the whole people. The improvement and repair of existing roads would be an improvement and repair in the interests of all, the motorists, in common with every other user of the roads, getting the advantage of an improved highway. I feel that an annual grant of $10,000, which is an exceedingly small percentage of the special contribution made annually to the revenue of the Colony by motorists might reasonably be appropriated. I do not approve, however, of the suggestion that the expenditure of any such allocation should be placed exclusively in the hands of the association. I would point out that all roads are public highways. For their conditions the department of public works is responsible. The control of the roads and their improvement and repair should consequently not be vested in the Motor Association or any private body, but should be vested in the department of public works. There might be a road commission on which the Motor Association would be properly represented, or a Motor Association committee might be organized to co-operate with the minister of public works, but the ultimate control and responsibility in connection with the opening up of new public roads and the improvement and repair of existing roads must vest in the minister of public works.

When the estimates for the coming year are laid before the house it will be seen that it is the intention of the government to open a highway from Deer Lake to Bonne Bay, and that an initial appropriation is being made for the necessary survey and the beginning of the work. ext year a further appropriation will be sought. It will also be seen that an appropriation is included to provide for a road from Elliston in the district of Trinity to the railway station, and an initial vote is being included in the

estimates for such work in connection therewith as it may be possible to undertake during the coming year. The estimates will also provide for an additional percentage increase in road grants throughout the entire Colony. References have been made by Dr. Jones of Avondale, the only sitting representative for the district of Harbor Main with respect to the condition of the roads in his district. The condition is deplorable, due to a considerable extent to the absolute waste of public funds in that district during the past few years. Last autumn while the political contest was in progress thousands of dollars were squandered on the Harbor Main roads by men being employed to dig the mud out of the trenches and throw it in the middle of the road, with the result that in November of last year the roads were in the most fearful condition imaginable. The bridges are bad and the roads generally are in an abominable state. This is not due to a lack expenditure of public funds on these roads. It is due to the dishonest manner in which the late minister of public works, Mr. Woodford, used the large funds provided by the late government for political purposes under the head of "road work."

The money was handed raound to the people as political graft, and in many cases the people understood when they received the money that the board of works cheque was to be regarded as a courteous consideration rather than a sum of money which must be represented by value in road work. Reports come from the Holyrood section that roads in that district are in a horrible condition. Hundreds of thousands of dollars were wasted in the district of Ferryland last autumn for political purposes in connection with road construction, but the entire grants of the district up to the 30th of June with the single exception of a sum of approximately $240.00 were spent in that district for political purposes last autumn. Little, if any, value was secured for the expenditure of that money, unless the leader of the opposition considers that his own election and the election of his colleague were good value for the public expenditure. Just as little, if any value was secured for the expenditure in Harbour Main unless the leader of the opposition considers that the election of his two candidates, the famous Woodford of affidavit notoriety and my friend Dr. Jones of Avondale represented value for the expenditure.

To sum up, I would say, first:

That the policy of the government is to remove from the road expenditure the politcial graft so pronounced under the late administration.

Second, to inaugurate a policy of securing reasonable value for road expenditure.

Third, to provide proper direction, supervision and control of road work.

Fourth, to enable the motorists to tax themselves very considerably so that motor car owners may themselves provide funds for road construction, improvement and repair.

Fifth, to permit the appropriation of a very small proportion of the annual tax paid into the revenue by motorists to be applied for special work in connection with roads used in common with the general public by those who pay these special taxes.

And last, to have the control of road work throughout the entire Island vested in the department of public works, of which Mr. Jennings, the minister, is a very conscientious and highly efficient head.

MR. BENNETT.—Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a few words on this subject. I am glad to hear

from the Prime Minister this afternoon that he contemplates to, in some way, alter the present process of system of road repairing in the districts of St. John's east and west. I am quite in accord with his remarks that a great deal of money has been wasted in the past in the repairing of roads in these districts. It is the system rather than anything else that we deplore. We are going on a system of road-making to-day that existed 50 years ago. I can speak with the fullest conviction that an absolute change is necessary for the building or roads. Last year the motor association made an effort, as indicated in this petition, to do something and asked the co-operation of the members of the districts as well as the assistance of the minister of public works. Their representations were given sympathetic consideration and as far as the district of St. John's west is concerned, I know that Mr. Bambrick the road inspector a gentleman whose qualification in his position, I have very much pleasure in stating here, is second to none in the community, carried out his orders to the best of his ability. I think that in one or two cases good work was accomplished, but on general lines it was impossible to meet the views of the association, because of the difficulty in procuring help and assistance at the time of the year that it was most desirable to make roads. It is absolutely impossible to get men to go to work at the time it is desirable for the making of roads. The work has got to be done in the early spring, often under adverse weather conditions as once the weather gets fine it is difficult to get men to go to work, practically all of them being employed at their farms, and it is only after they get their crops in the ground that it is at all possible to get them. Then you are up in the middle of the summer and you are driving over newly repaired roads that are not in a fit condition until beaten down and hardened through traffic. Then again our roads are so shallow and lack that necessary bottom that they are often entirely destroyed through the frost of a subsequent winter. If you will notice in passing along our country roads a great many of them are built over marshes. Take for instance the Goulds road. A very large portion of it is built entirely over a marsh. It is merely a gravel path through a marsh and when the frost goes through it, it is thrown out of kilter and requires the same attention each succeeding year. I submit that the petition set forth this afternoon will help to bring about a remedy of present conditions. What you want in the first place is large capital so that when the roads once built can be kept in proper repair. A great deal can be done, as suggested this afternoon, with the introduction of road-making machinery. What we require in the supurbs of St. John's are small steam-rollers for making roads more solid. I think that with the innovation of the necessary machinery a great deal of good can be done. One thing that has not been ventilated to a sufficient degree this afternoon and that is the position of the city council with regard to the increased tax asked for in this petition. Now the motor cars are already taxed and the city itself receives half of this tax but I do not think that the city council will be prepared to relinquish their portion. And if that tax is increased I see no reason why they are not entitled to their portion of the increase. After all the main wear and tear done to city roads is caused by the motor cars more than to the country roads and if the motor association wants roads built entirely for their own purpose let them build a

boulevard for themselves with government assistance so that they will not clash with the government or the department in charge of same. It has been suggested that the road leading from Holyrood across to Witless Bay could be used as a highway for motor cars only, and I am sure that if put in condition it would be found to be as good a road for a pleasure drive as there is in the country. But it is nonsensical to be trifling with the question until the motor association have sufficient funds, because the building of a road around Conception Bay is going to cost something like one hundred thousand dollars do anything like what is contemplated without any regard to other roads. It means a large expenditure at the outset in order to have good roads permanently. The roads have to be rebuilt annually and methods, different entirely to what prevails at present will have to be adopted before you will be able to keep the roads in permanent good repair. Therefore I would like to say that before this is taken up by the government that a commission be appointed to enquire into the whole matter. As has been pointed out already this evening, the gentlemen who constitute the motor association know nothing about the technical work of building roads. They merely desire to have good roads. You might have money and you might spend money and not have good roads afterwards. That is my opinion so far as the district of St. John's west is concerned to-day. You will not get the value for the money you spend under present conditions and under present methods, and until such methods are inaugurated and road-making machinery is adopted you are not going to succeed in bringing about any tangible improvements. Some of the roads in the district of St. John's west are in fairly good condition. The Thorburn road was never better probably than at the present time; also the Goulds road is kept in as good a condition as possible, considering the facilities at the disposal of the department of public works and the available labour supply.

I am also perfectly in accord with the idea with regard to concrete bridges. It is the policy adopted with in the past few years. When the old structures were worn out concrete bridges or culverts were substituted. The result is that you will have no further repairs to do in that direction in future. I only hope that the Prime Minister, who has declared in some measure his policy in this respect, will continue to do something tangible, and I feel sure that after a short experience he will be gratified with results. I have every sympathy with the motor association, and I have every desire to assist them and to see that the roads are given a reasonable amount of attention in St. John's, but I certainly think is improper for the Department of Public Works to delegate its authority and its power to any corporation or any individuals who may desire to superintend the roads and their upkeep. The roads are under the supervision of the Minister of Public Works and his two inspectors, Messrs. Bambrick and Parsons, representing St. John's West and East, respectively. Give them a fair show by giving them machinery to improve present methods of road repairing and road building. The motor association as has been said before can assist in a great measure and nothing they can do is too much, because there is no agency that destroy the roads as much as the motor car. It practically sucks the substance out of the road. If one will take notice every car passing over a road tear considerable filling material of the road and leave nothing but stones that is exactly what is destroying the roads.

I desire to discontinue my remarks for the present with a view to having something further to say if the Government decide to bring in any measure dealing with this subject.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES:—They are willing to be taxed to carry out certain proposals and they also ask that out of the same amount of the fund derived from the motor cars a certain proportion be handed over to the commission, that is fifty per cent. of the revenue and I estimate that the revenue that will come from themselves will be about twenty thousand dollars and therefore the amount given them will be ten thousand and I think we ought to be willing to go as far as that but I think with this proviso that the amount should not exceed that. We mgiht let them have the amount up to $10,000 but not exceeding. Next year they will want to increase this. No doubt there will be a tremendous influx of cars and everybody is going to have one. Well, I think if the revenue has been two hundred and fifty thousand dollars on the importation of cars, we are not committing any great offence in handing over to them ten thousand dollars. When the bill comes before the House and it gets into shape to meet the requirements of all concerned I intend to support it with that simple proviso that the sum shall not exceed ten thousand dollars and I think that ought to be satisfactory to the petitioners and I feel the outport people will welcome this inauguration of road improvement and building of roads. It is a new system and the time has come when we can no longer build roads with spades and the other old-fashioned implements. We have turned two new leaves. One is the petition and the other is the intention of the Government to import motor trucks and other up-to-date machinery to construct and repair roads and when the bill comes before the House I will no doubt give my support to it.

MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS:—Mr. Chairman, I notice that Trinity District is conspicuous by its absence in this bill. I think I expressed myself already on this bill when speaking to the petition and I cannot say that I am in favor of it. That part of the bill which asks for government support I do not endorse, but outside of that it strikes me that Trinity District should be included in the bill. Motor cars go to Heart's Content from Carbonear, and St. John's, but they do not go beyond these places. There is a very good road from Heart's Content to New Perlican and it would be a grand thing if that road were improved right down to Lead Cove; in fact, I see no reason why the South Side of the bay should not be included in the bill.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Alright, the south side will be included.

MR. CHEESEMAN:—Mr. Chairman, it might be news to some people perhaps, to know that the District of Burin has got motor cars, and, now that there are going to be special givings out in the way of motor roads, Burin is going to ask for its share. I cannot say that I am in perfect agreement with the object of this bill. If all the districts were compensated in the way of special grants it would be a good idea, but to give grants to districts that have the advantage of a railway and with roads much better than we have in the District of Burin, I cannot see that I would be doing justice to my constituents to support the bill and give money out of the general revenue of the country to the particular sections named in the bill. And, as I said before, we actually have motor cars in burin now.

MR. FOX:—I with the permission of the Speaker beg present a number of petitions from various places in the E. End of St. John's asking that a modification of the prohibition law be grant-

ed. The petition is largely signed by thousands of the residents and I commend it to the consideration of the Government and ask that it be referred to the department to which it appertains.

THE HON. PRIME MINISTER:—I beg to lay upon the table of the House various information asked for some days ago.

THE HON. PRIME MINISTER:—I ask to have the matter deferred as the printer has not sent the resolutions up to the House (to move the House to consider certain resolutions with reference to the posts, etc.)

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the bill entitled "An Act to Amend Cap. X. of 9-10 Geo.. V. entitled 'An Act with respect to existing Tenancies and the Ejectment Therefrom."' was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the bill entitled "An Act Respecting License to Cut Hardwood" was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the bill entitled "An Act to Check Profiteering" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that it be engrossed being entitled as above and that it be senet to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the bill entitled "An Act to amend the Income Tax Act, 1918" 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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider the bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Consolidated Statutes of Nfld. (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Encouragement of Agriculture."'

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Scammell took the chair of committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The chairman from the committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the bill without amendment.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the House resolved itself into committee of the whole to consider the bill entitled "An Act respecting Certificates of Masters and Mates."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of committee.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Speaker, with reference to this bill I would like to say that I do not think the bill is going to have the good effect contemplated. Under the present law and the provisions of the Merchant Shipping Acts certificates can be granted we all know, but the undesirable conditions existing for a number of years past in this Colony has been brought to the notice of the public in the judgment just handed down in the loss of the s.s. Delenac. I know that the Honorable Minister is conversant with the terms of that judgment and I would like to draw attention to some salient sections of it particularly the last paragraph on page seven and eight. The marine court consisting of Judge Morris, Captain

Fenn and Captain Edward English, Sr., has handed down this judgment. The sections I refer to are on page seven of the judgment (reads the various sections). The report of the Registrar of Shipping is very important (reads it).

MR. FOX:—Now that probably is one of the most important judgments ever handed down by the courts of Newfoundland. In the past few years our laws with respect to the competency of men in charge of schooners have not been carried out. With respect to the bill and its desire to convenience certain men it is going to have the effect of placing men in charge who are incompetent. The report of the Registrar of Shipping points out that in only one case, of the large number of ships lost, was the master certificated. Men are going across in charge of crews who do not know the starboard from the port. In the case that I have cited the mate did not know the starboard from the port. We allow conditions of that sort to operate in Newfoundland. We have never taken the trouble to enforce the law. We have allowed incompetent men to go across in charge of lives of other men. Now I don't see how we are going to reconcile the conditions of this bill with the proper conditions. I recognize that there are four or five men who because of lack of education and in view of their long and faithful service should be given masters' certificates. But this should not apply to young men who may have been good soldiers, but who have neither the knowledge of navigation or the experience to become either masters or mates. It may be alright for coastal service, but it is not alright when it comes to foreign going. I have had conversation with some of the leading captains with respect to this bill, and this bill does not meet with the requirements that they consider necessary. It will be impossible to entrust vessels, cargoes, and particularly the lives of crews to men who are entirely incompetent. In certain cases men have qualified as naval seamen, and have been promoted to higher offices, and it might be all right to grant certificates under certain provisions. I think men who become mates should have certificates of competency or should not tbe allowed to take the responsible position.

Attempts have been made to hoodwink the authorities by changing the registers of the ships so that the men would be competent. I have known of several such cases. The men have not the sense of security that they should have. The Canadian law was taken advantage of until that law also had to be changed in order to put a stop to the practice. This matter is not receiving the serious consideration that it should receive. We have the most loosely carried out laws that can be found anywhere. Men are allowed to go captains of foreign going schooners who are not fit to be captains of row boats. As a maritime country we must wake up to our responsibility. It is not a mere consideration of dollars and cents, not even of the vessels and the cargoes. In a great many cases the owners may be quite willing to sell to the insurance companies. But it is the lives of the men, who, in some cases, have large families depending upon them. I suggest that the present law be not changed, but that it be enforced. We have certain laws, and it is only necessary that those laws be enforced. Captain English, because of his world-wide experience, and of his highly commendable work some months ago in rsecuing the lives of the people on the Ethie, is recognized as an authority by everybody. I do not believe that he would be in favor of a bill of this sort. I cannot conceive of anybody being in favor of a bill of this sort. I cannot conceive of anybody being in favor of placing incompetent

men in charge of vessels. We ought to see that the law is carried out, and that certificates of competency are required of men who are to go in vessels as masters and mates.

The most amusing feature of the whole thing, if amusing it might be termed, is that here in Newfoundland, in spite of its being a purely maritime country, navigation seems to be the last subject that is taken up. Now I would propose that navigation be made a compulsory subject in our schools, at least for those who have any intention of following the sea. The present navigation school, so ably conducted by Mr. Doyle, has worked wonders, but he has to shoulder all the responsibility of fitting men to safeguard the lives of seamen and passengers, on him alone devolves the duty of training our master mariners although he is working under great difficulties. We have not the facilities with which to carry on this important work as it should be carried on and I would propose that the government make some provision in this regard. There is no doubt that the hon. minister sees what he considers to be good reason for this bill and it is not my intention to vexatiously criticise it, but this is a matter which we cannot afford to lightly consider. I notice that the board provided for under this bill ceases to exist after 1921, but we do not know what will happen within the next few months and we cannot take the chance of having that happen which we might reproach ourselves in time to come. No vessel should be allowed to leave this port or any port in Newfoundland without a master who has all the necessary qualifications to ensure the safety of the lives of those in his charge, for no matter how experienced a man may be, if he has not the knowledge that will enable him to successfully meet and cope with any and every situation that might arise, he is not qualified to command a ship. We know, of course, that a man with no knowledge of navigation might do certain things to avert disaster should the occasion arise, but we kno walso that a thorough knowledge of navigation is absolutely necessary, for no amount of experience can avail a man who has not that knowledge when he requires it. We are taking a great responsibility by allowing a course to be adopted which might result in the loss of valuable lives, and unless there is absolutely no other means of overcoming the difficulty that confronts us, I think that we should hesitate in putting this into effect.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—Mr. Chairman, I've listened with a great deal of attention to the interesting speech of the hon. member for St. John's East, Mr. Fox, and if there is any better way in which we can overcome the difficulty with which we are faced, I am ready to adopt it. As I have already said, what this bill is intended to do is to improve conditions as they exist at present and to give the best men that we have a chance. There are in Newfoundland altogether 107 foreign going vessels, 62 in St. John's and the remaining 45 in the outports, and out of this number of vessels we have only five certificated captains. Now, if you enforce the law already on the statute book, the position simply is that practically the whole of our foreign going fleet must be tied up because there is no one to man them. What we want to do is to cull the best men out of the number now sailing as masters and eliminate those who are not competent. You will find many men to-day, such as Moore, Rose, Jeans, Fudge, Wakeham, and others, who are as capable of commanding a vessel as any man who ever had master's certificate and under our present law every one of these would be cut out. We want to select from

those available men who can be given command of vessels without risk and the men who do not come up to the standard will not be allowed to sail as masters. The situation is no bed of roses I assure you, and attention has been drawn to it by the Board of Trade, while I presume it has also come to the notice of His Excellency the Governor. Almost every time a vessel goes to sea now we are breaking the law, but to put that law in force means that at least ninety vessels are without captains, and under these circumstances what are you going to do? This solution of the difficulty was suggested by the Board of Trade and I talked the matter over with Sir John Crosbie, who has a wide experience, gained not alone from years in the commercial trade of the country, but also from his activities in the department of shipping, and what we thought was that if the matter was placed in the hands of three such men as Capt. English it would be safe to assume that no one would get a ticket who should not get it, but men who are not qualified when the term of this bill expires will have to qualify in the usual way, and when the bill comes into effect we want it strictly enforced, and only men of first class quality will be considered. We have the machinery here for fitting our seamen to qualify as masters and after next year no man will be allowed to take command who does not meet the requirements of the law. If there is any better way I am willing to adopt it; I merely want to do what is best under the circumstances.

Now, as to the outport vessels there are (Reads list).

I have no doubt that this bill will meet the requirements of the case and for that reason I have introduced it. If there is any good and sound reason why it should not pass, I have no objection. But I do not see why men should not be qualified and certificated if they are fully competent and experienced, if they have never lost a vessel, and if they have at all times proved themselves good seamen.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—Mr. Chairman, I support the remarks of the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries on the ground that I think I know something about this matter, and I think that if my hon. friend, Mr. Fox, had as much experience in this regard as I have, he would see things differently. If he had been Minister of Shipping during the years of the war and had seen some of the things these men did I do not think he would have any doubt as to the wisdom of this bill. When we had to depend on our vessels to bring us our food supply, these are the men who accomplished the task and by doing so they proved that they were qualified to command. Now I agree with my hon. friend that every young man going to sea should have training in navigation, but that in itself does not necessarily make a man competent. I have had personal experience of that. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has very nicely referred to one of my captains. I took him out of the forecastle and he worked his way up till he became as competent to command a vessel as any man who has a certificate out of this port to-day. When I started business I paid a good deal of attention to this matter because I wanted to know who was the good man and who was not, and I found that the certificated man was not always the best. I had had men in my ships who had certificates, but there was no satisfaction with them and they seldom made more than the one trip. I was driven out of this country, forced to go to Canada and Barbados to register my vessels because of the law which prevented me from putting in command good men because they did not have a captain's ticket. In 1917, when the re-

strictions were on because the submarine campaign was at its height in the Mediterranean, 15 or 16 of our vessels were held up with cargoes and would have remained tied up indefinitely if one of them had not taken the chance and started, and it was an uncertificated man who took the lead which the others followed. Mr. Coaker has pointed out that there are 107 foreign going vessels in the country with only three or four passed captains amongst them and under these circumstances the only thing to do is to pick out the men who can satisfy the board that they are competent to sail as masters and give them certificates.

MR. FOX:—Words used by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that the law should insist that captains carry a certificate of competency. I have here an item taken from a local newspaper headed "Where our vessels are today." It gives a list of 129 ships that are now down on the bottom of the sea, and only one man on that 129 ships carried a certificate of competency. As regards the statement made by Sir John Crosbie that uncertified men have done great work during the past few years that certified captains couldn't do may be quite true. I don't wish to pass any assertions. This is not the time to say nice things about those who go down to the sea in ships. We should see that our law is rigorously enforced. Certified men have been driven out of this country because in many cases preference has been given to others who didn't hold certificates of competency. Whoever is responsible for this position I am not prepared to say. We have men no doubt who are qualified to master a vessel, but they should hold certificates. There is, as has been stated, 107 men competent to take ships across the ocean, but they are not competent to get a certificate. We should not tolerate this condition of things. In a great many cases men have been placed in command of vessels who would not be able to do so if the law was carried out. I can fairly well see the point the hon. Minister has in his mind to rectify but he might just as well leave the present conditions continue. During 1919 and 1920 vessels were lost that would now be afloat if qualified skippers were in command. We should not tolerate the sending to sea of ships without certified men. I think we ought to be totally ashamed of ourselves. No maritime country has been so careless as Newfoundland in the past few years. I think the sooner we realize our responsibilities in this matter and see that the law is carried out the better.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—I don't know any other way out of it myself. If these regulations were put into effect to-morrow the whole foreign-going trade would be held up. I think that young men should be given the opportunity to go up to Doyle's and pass their examinations and receive a certificate of competency. I have a man down there with me now who is a practical man without a certificate, but if he were to get down on his knees to me to-morrow and ask for a certificate I wouldn't give it to him. I would say go up to Doyle's and pass your examination and get your certificate. If a man is qualified to command a ship he will get a certificate, but if he is not he won't. My own object is to get over the difficulty with which we are faced. I told Mr. Coaker that I would go on the board, as the position has come about now that we have never before got into. I believe myself that a great many of the ships that went across were not lost through the incompetency of the masters. I have seen ships leave this port to go across the ocean, and they were not fit to go across. A man who has been in the service from 12 to 20 years must be considered a

very important man, and having the experience he is no doubt just as competent to be master o fa vessel as a man who carries a certificate.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—Mr. Speaker, in seconding the motion for an adjournment of the House, I would like to ask the Hon. Prime Minister for a reply to a question of mine of yesterday as to what is the exact position concerning the salt situation now?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, I may say that the salt situation is exceedingly serious in that four steamers have been delayed at Cadiz from ten to fifteen days because of the strike. The Newfoundland government, through His Excellency the Governor, have been in touch with the Imperial government and with Eir Edgar Bowring in London with a view to getting our steamers loaded. The second position is that an effort is being made with Messrs. Bowring Brothers in Liverpool to get one of their steamers to bring a cargo of salt from Liverpool to St. John's, and it is expected that a steamer will leave there within the course of a few days. This matter is being handled by cable between Messrs. Bowring Brothers, St. John's, His Excellency the Governor ,and the various officials both in Spain and in England. It is hoped that the negotiations pending for the securing of a steamer at Liverpool will be satisfactorily matured; also the cargo that will be brought by this steamer will be exceptionally large.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Prime Minister to lay upon the Table of the House copies of all communications that took place between the Government, His Excellency the Governor and Sir Edgar Bowring; also all messages sent to any authorities in Spain and any information he has in regard to steamers now loading in Europe. If he will table all the correspondence I will be glad.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—That will be done.

MR. HIGGINS:—Some of us find ourselves in a very peculiar situation regarding this What Mr. Fox has said is absolutely sound and it is what out of 107 foreign going ships we have only five certified commanders amongst them, but, the proportion as to the number lost is quite all right. They must of necessity be there. We recognize that the government of to-day is faced with a very serious problem in connection with the certificates of masters and mates. It must be clearly understood that unless you are prepared to put duly certified men on board the ships you are going to make it very hard for the trade. It is a condition of affairs that is going to be very awkward to get over, and the more awkward part is that you practically tell the men who you really are going to give certiflcates to. They are absolutely undoubtedly unqualified men and I am not speaking in a spirt of opposition to the bill because I can't oppose it. But we are going back to the days when masters and mates were given certificates of service for general conduct, and it appears that we are in that position after all the years that have passed. It is practically desirous that this should go on, and the trouble is I cannot see how we are going to put the new law into effect, because if it be a fact that we have to-day a hundred or so vessels without certified commanders we cannot tie up the whole bunch, because that would be serious to the country and therefore we cannot apply the law, therefore I ask is it advisable to enact this legislation. I take it that the object is to cull the crowd and have certificates given to those who have passed their examinations.

If a man is engaged in the local trade and he holds a certificate for that trade he will not be qualified for the foreign trade, and that means that any young man who gets it into his head

that Newfoundland trade is good enough for him he is not going to try and qualify for the foreign trade. I still think that it is a pretty difficult position to-day that we are in and that men who have been in the trade so long have now to turn around and take up examinations for certificates of competency. If the law was applied we could tie up the trade because in Newfoundland vessels to-day we have only five certified men to run 107 vessels. In my opinion it is not possible to get certified men. It is unfortunate that in this country the study of navigation in its proper sense has never been brought into it. The man who has been on the seas for years will find it a very hard job now to get down to his trigonometry to-day and get into the technical side of the subject, but I freely support and I am content to support this bill.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN referred to the forest fires and the Prime Minister replied.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I concur in the observations made by the Minister of Public Works and the hon. the leader of the opposition in their criticisms on the Reid Newfoundland Company who are openly and flagrantly defying the law of the land.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—I did not make any such statement.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I am aware that my honourable friend did not criticise the Reid Newfoundland Co. He rather criticised the government because of the fact that the Reid Nfld. Co. were setting fire to the country because the spark arrestors on their engines were deficient. I fully appreciate the fine distinction which the honourable the leader of the opposition is drawing in this connection. The Reid Nfld. Co. has been notified on numerous occasions by the government engineer that their spark arrestors must be real arrestors and kept in good condition, and the Minister of Agriculture and Mines has written the government engineer on a number of occasions with respect to the matter. The Reid Nfld. Co. has assured both the Government Engineer and the Minister of Agriculture and Mines that these spark arrestors are efficient and kept in good working order. As a matter of fact, it is now well known that the spark arrestors are insufficient and kept in bad order. One engine, No. 121, I believe, in a few hours journey caused twelve fires. The fact is that the Reid Nfld. Co. engines are mostly junk and find it impossible to get up any pressure of steam. The engineers frequently have to run a crowbar through the spark arrestors, otherwise the engines would not be able to crawl along at all. Every pressure that can be put upon the Reid Nfld. Co. short of legal process has been put to compel them to use every precaution in this regard. Notices have been put up in the trains calling the attention of passengers to the importance of care in the use of matches, cigars and cigarettes. The recent fires which done so much damage have in many instances been due to the Reid Nfld. Co. and their indifference to and defiance of the law. I have only to say that if the Department of Agriculture and Mines and the Government Engineer find that the Reid Nfld. Co. are persistent in defying their instructions, the Reid Nfld. Co. will be prosecuted.

Second reading of bill "An Act to Authorize the Montreal Trust Co. to do Business in the Colony of Newfoundland."

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this bill I may say that this bill gives powers to the Montreal Trust Co. the same as the Royal Trust Co. and the Eastern Trust Co. to do business in the Colony of Newfoundland.

Second reading of bill, "An Act with Respect to Existing Tenancies and the Ejectment Therefrom."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—This bill is a very brief one. It contains one section only and has the effect of extending the act for a period of one year. The act now on the Statute Book expired on the 7th day of April last. The intention of this bill is to keep the act in force until the seventh day of April, 1921.

Second reading of Council's amendments to "An Act Respecting the Exportation of Codfish."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I move that the amendments made by the Honorable the Legislative Council to this bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Exportation of Codfish" be now read a second time. As already explained, the amendments are merely verbal and confirm rather than modify the principle involved in the act as it passed this House.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—Mr. Speaker, in seconding the motion for an adjournment of the house, I would like to ask the Hon. Prime Minister for a reply to a question of mine of yesterday as to what is the exact position concerning the salt situation now?

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The chairman from the committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the bill without amendment.

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

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries tabled the annual report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, 1919.

Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Preservation of Beavers."

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled "An Act Respecting Former Enemy Aliens."

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, May 27th, 1920.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—In answer to the question which the hon. leader of the opposition asks, I would say that on yesterday I had an interview with the chairman of the Food Control Board, who states that it would be impracticable for him to furnish copies of the correspondence which has taken place between the Food Control Board and the business firms, both local and foreign, with respect to the importation of sugar. The hon. member will appreciate the fact that the correspondence of the Food Control Board in connection with such matters is of a confidential business character and unless under special circumstances should not be disclosed. The hon. member will note that in the Act to Check Profiteering there is a special proviso that while the proceedings before the court in matters of complaint shall be held in public where proceedings are founded on the complaint the information and documents required to be given or produced to the board must be treated as confidential except certainly in cases where legal proceedings are taken and the information has to be used in the course of proceedings. It is essential that the private information concerning private business affairs which is disclosed by business men to the board should be carefully protected from publicity.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS—I ask leave to present a petition from the residents of Catalina and Port Union. The petition asks that immediate steps be taken to remedy the abuses under the present Prohibition Act. I hope it will receive the serious consideration of the Government. I ask leave to also present a petition from the Rev. Mr Young and others of Shoal Harbour, T.B., on the same subject. I ask leave to also present a number of petitions from certain sections of Trinity district asking that certain modifications be made in the Prohibition Act. I notice that some of these petitions have no witness to the signature. Anyway I present them for what they are worth without comment, for the consideration of the government.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE—I ask leave to present a petition from the chairman of the road board of Port de Grave which asks that the allocation of the sum of two thousand dollars be granted for the erection of a public wharf. He says that he would be very glad to have this amount and I might say that to my personal experience the wharf is in a very bad condition. I would like to ask the hon. minister of marine and fisheries to take this matter into his consideration and hope he will grant the request, as there are many fishermen who use this place, and I sincerely trust he will be able to accede to this request.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER.—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay upon the table of the house the annual report of the General Hospital for the year ending the 31st December, 1919.

MR. HIGGINS—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of the Battery, St. John's East, with respect to the question whether certain territory there is under the control of the Government or under the jurisdiction of the city as it is at the present time. At this stage I do not ask that it receive the serious consideration, as shortly a bill will come before the house dealing with the matter, and I merely ask that the petition be referred to the Colonial Secretary.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS & TELEGRAPHS—I ask leave to present a petition from the electors of Catalina, Little Catalina, and Melrose, Trinity district, on the subject of the erection of a public building at Catalina. There used to be a court house at Catalina, but in the year 1915 the so-called court house was burned down. For some time the court was held in the parish hall. Catalina is of very great importance because of its nearness to Port Union. Port Union is a new town and will lend importance to Trinity district and the whole Dominion because of the prestige it will have in the future. This building is a necessity owing to the importance of Catalina and Port Union. In fact the importance of these two places will grow from year to year because they are becoming thickly populated. I might say that as far back as the year 1912 or 13 the Morris administration being the Government of the day would have readily granted the money for the erection of the public building to be used as a court house, custom house and postal telegraphs, but at the time the site was not decided upon and up to the present time the matter has been in abeyance. The petition is largely signed and include the names of the clergymen of all denominations as well as all the leading citizens, also Rev. Father Dwyer and Hon. Philip Templeman of Bonavista. The petition also has the support of the Morning Star L.O.L. of Catalina, the F. P. U. Council and Caribou Lodge S. U. F. I give this petition my hearty support.

MR. SAMSON—Mr. Speaker, I could not let this opportunity go by without giving this petition presented by the hon. minister of posts and telegraphs, my hearty support. Catalina is a town of very great importance and is what the northern fishermen call the half-way house to St. John's, and I venture to say that there is no other town in the Island of such importance as Catalina, and I think it is time that a public building be erected there. I think the people of Catalina, and in fact the people of the whole district should have had this long ago. From a common point of view there has been a great waste of money in paying high rents and hire. I believe enough money has been expended to build one. I give the petition my hearty support and I think the government would do well to consider that petition and erect a public building in the near future.

MR. TARGETT—Mr. Speaker, I want to give my support to the prayer of the petition presented by the hon. minister of posts and telegraphs. Catalina is a place of great importance and is a worthy place to erect a good public building to be used as court house. I give my hearty support to the prayer of the petition.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES—I beg to support the prayer of the petition presented by the minister of posts and telegraphs and trust that the opponents of Port Union will not be blaming me for asking for the erection of a public building at that place. I have often felt ashamed of the public conditions existing in Catalina, which is a very large town. If the building is erected it will be used as a court house and postal telegraph office, and Port Union wil not benefit thereby. At Catalina at present there is a building of about twelve by fifteen. This is altogether too small for the business of the community. The time has come for the erection of a public building there. I will do all in my power to assist the minister of posts and telegraphs in endeavoring to get the government to grant the sufficient sum of money for the erection of such a building. The present time is not a very suitable time for the erection of it because of the high cost of labor and material, but I have not much faith in the reduction of the prices, and I think when it comes up the members of the districts concerned will do all in their power to assist in the erection of this building.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—I ask leave to present a petition from South River, Clark's Beach, and Salmon Cove. It is signed by one hundred and five persons who ask for the modification of the present Prohibition Act. I would like to say that unlike the petition presented by the minister of posts and telegraphs this petition has a witness to the signatures of the one hundred and five gentlemen appended thereto. I believe the matter is signed in the proper way and that the signatures are absolutely correct, and I reserve my right to talk on the matter when the prime minister, in accordance with his manifesto, brings in the promised bill. Then I will have something to say.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—Mr. Speaker, when I left the House my desk was clear, but on returning I find that it is covered with petitions for a moderation of the Prohibition Act. I beg leave to present these petitions.

MR. BENNETT:—Like my hon. friend I also beg leave to present a number of petitions for a moderation of the Prohibition Act. These petitions are largely signed by a number of influential men in St. John's West. I trust that the petitions will receive the

consideration from the Government that they deserve.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Gambo on the subject of moderation of the Prohibition Act.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave also to present a petition from the people of Carbonear on the same subject.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS:—Mr. Speaker, Mr. Targett has just presented me with another batch of petitions on the subject of modification of the Prohibition Act from Trinity District. I beg to present these petitions.

MR. TARGETT:—Mr. Speaker, the gentlemen of the House may think it queer that I did not present these petitions myself: but the reason is that I understand that these petitions were sent around and signed by the people, and the people did not know what they meant.

HON. MR. FOOTE:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of High Beach asking for telegraph communication from Fortune to Lamaline, a distance of about twenty-five miles. The petition also asks for a sum of money to repair the public highways in that section.

MR. CHEESEMAN:—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petition just presented by my colleague. The people in that section of the District of Burin are greatly handicapped. There is not a harbor where they can moor a boat. It is a good farming area and there is a number of prosperous fishing settlements. The District of Burin has generally been neglected, but no section more than this one. I hope that the prayer of this petition will be granted.

MR. TARGETT:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of (name of place left out) for a sum of money to repair a road there which was opened up sixteen years ago and to which nothing has been done since. This road is very badly in need of repair and I hope the Government will see their way clear to grant the prayer of this petition.

MR. JONES:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the District of Twillingate on the subject of prohibition. Whether this petition was signed by the people or not I don't know.

HON. MINISTER POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present two petitions from the people of New Harbor on the subject of roads. I think the prayer of the petition will be granted.

HON. MINISTER POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Clarenville also on the subject of roads.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS:—I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Hodge's Cove, Trinity District, asking for a sum of money to build a public wharf. I support the prayer of the petition and the same be received and referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Norman's Cove concerning telephone or telegraph communication. This is of more than passing interest. Norman's Cove is quite an important settlement, and is entirely cut off from outside places. The nearest telegraph office is 14 miles away. Communication by telegraph is very important. From the standpoint of revenue we stand to lose, but from the humane point of view something should be done. It may be the means of saving life. However, the money

can be found I would support petitions coming in from the various settlements for telegraph communication. I know that if Mr. Gosse was in the House he would support this petition. He has been trying to get in touch with some men there for the fishery, and hasn't been able to do so. This whole matter of petitions for more adequate communication should receive the serious consideration of the Government.

MR. TARGETT:—Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this petition.

Mr. Bennett gave notice of question.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS:—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present another petition, this time from the electors of Elliston in the District of Trinity. The petition is signed by Rev. W. W. Cotton and all the voters of Elliston, and asks for the sum of $10,000 to build a road from Elliston to the railway station. The matter of railway connection was taken up with the Government by the people of Elliston last year when they were asking for an extension of some three and a half miles to assist them in getting their produce to market. It seems that they have given up that idea for the present and are now asking for a road so built as to make it fit to operate a motor truck. Elliston is peculiarly situated, it being so rough there that they have no public wharf and they can only put out a stage in the spring which has to be taken in again in the winter. It is not a port of call for the coastal boats and during the past few years it has been difficult to get even schooners to call there. The people are debarred from all the or-

their fish to Bonavista, a distance of four or five miles or to the station which is about the same distance away. They are working under grave difficulties and it is only with much labor and expense that they can get their produce and supplies back and forth. Now I had this in mind when I spoke yesterday on the matter of the Government making improvements on the motor roads in the vicinity of St. John's. Here we have a whole community numbering 1000 people, and all fishermen, except perhaps half a dozen storekeepers, and these men have to get their produce to market by means of this road. I am sure, therefore, that the Government will give their request every consideration altho it may seem rather high. We may not be able to give the full amount this year, but half of it could be voted and the balance next year, and when the money is granted a good road should be built. In the past thousands of dollars have been wasted on roads. I trust this petition will receive the most favorable consideration of the Government.

MR. TARGETT:—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of this petition. I had in mind yesterday when this House was discussing the petition asking for the improvement of motor roads, that if these people could see how hard these fishermen have to work to get their fish off they would remember that there are other demands on the public funds more important than theirs. I trust, Mr. Speaker, that this petition will be given every consideration.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in giving my hearty support to the petition just presented by the Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs as senior member for the District of Trinity. I have some personal knowledge of the matter to which the petition relates, having once upon a time been the representative of that constituency and I know that the situation is an exceedingly grave one. There is no harbor at Elliston and for the greater part of the year no vessels can call there. The distance to the railway station is but short, but there is no means of communication and I do think that the amount of taxes these

people pay, their thrift, industry and the volumne of their business entitles them to the consideration for which they ask.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Speaker, as this seems to be one o fthe petitions likely to receive the sympathy of the Government, I give it my support, and I would remind the Government at the same time of a petition yesterday from the district which I represent making a similar request. I trust that when the petition now before the House is granted that the amount asked for in the other will also be voted as the need for it is just as great as that which the Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs has referred to.

Hon. the Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council, informing him that that body had passed the Marine and Fisheries bill, and the St. Lawrence Pulp and Lumber Co. bill, both without amendment.

Hon. Prime Minister tabled report of General Hospital for year ended December 31st, 1918.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council, acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the bill sent up entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 11 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (third series), entitled 'Of the Department of Marine and Fisheries,'" 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 Confirm a Contract between the Government and the St. Lawrence Timber, Pulp and Steamship Company, Limited," without amendment.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the bill entitled "An Act for the Preservation of Beavers" was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on tomorrow.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES asked leave to introduce a bill entitled "An Act respecting the Preservation of Beavers."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I ask leave to introduce this bill. The last section has reference to state insurance and provides that any beaver skins being confiscated are to be appropriated by the Minister of Finance and Customs and the amount realized for them to be devoted to this purpose. It is the intention of the Government to inaugurate a system of state insurance under which every man from eighteen years upwards may be insured for a nominal amount so that our fishermen and others, when through accident or other cause, they pass out, their dependents will not be left entirely without the means of subsistence.

On motion the bill was read a first time and was ordered to be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the bill entitled "An Act respecting Former Enemy Aliens" was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider certain resolutions on the subject of the Postal and Telegraph Services.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of committee.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS:—The house will have noticed that on the telegraph form

now in use there are certain conditions with which the sender of a message has to comply with regard to the non-delivery or loss of telegrams or delays or loss in transmission. It says:

Now as regards the liability of the government for mistakes in messages, or delay in the transmission of messages, I don't think that we are confirmed in that attitude, in the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland, and the object of this bill is to make these conditions legal and whether the person, who sends the message, signs to those conditions or not, he is supposed to know, that the Government is not liable for any mistake in the message or delays in the transmission of the message. It is within the knowledge of the house, that errors have been made in transmission, whereby the sender of the message, or the person to whom it was sent, suffered certain losses, an error was made in numbers, five for fifteen or something like that. Well, it is unfortunate, that these mistakes should happen, but the postal telegraph officials are no mor einfallible than any other people, and I don't think that it would be in the interests of the community that we should be liable for mistakes of that nature.

Now the next section of this bill. section 2 refers to the registration fee. The registration fee at the present time is 3 cents and we are making it 5 cents. Our expenses are increasing day by day. Mails are accumulating, and we have to get more couriers and they are asking for higher wages, and this matter of an increase from three to five cents on the registration fee, will give us an increase in the revenue of fifty five hundred dollars, and this will help to meet the increasing expenses of the department.

The next clause relates to a delivery clause on parcels received from abroad containing dutiable goods. In Great Britain, they have a charge of four cents, or tuppence, on such parcels, and we propose to ask the same amount. This will give us an increase in the revenue of fifteen hundred dollars. The expenses for stationery, in connection with the department are increasing all the time, and this bill is introduced as a means to help these increasing expenses.

MR. BENNETT.—Mr. Chairman, before these resolutions go through I must say that it strikes me that this bill is a retrograde movement. In the establishment of a new department I think that if the house is unanimous that it is a move in the right direction that the head of the Postal Telegraph Department should be a member of the executive government, as the many things that come up it is very difficult for the minister of that department to handle them, unless he is a member of the executive government. Heretofore the Colonial Secretary has been the representative of that department in the executive, but owing to the many onerous duties that he has to perform it is impossible for him to account for the things that come up continually in that connection. The intention to insert a clause regarding the correct delivery of messages is one of a very serious character. It must be appreciated in this country that it is very difficult to get competent operators. While we have a great number who are thoroughly competent and do their work in a very satisfactory manner, I think that the house will agree with me that there have been many glaring instances of incompetency on the part of telegraph operators. My mind goes back to one case in particular, where because a message was incorrectly copied, a serious loss was realized by the sender. Business messages are

useless unless they are correctly copied. The sender might be negotiating for fifteen hundred barrels of flour, fifteen hundred hogsheads of salt, and or fifteen hundred barrels of pork, or through some mistake the message might read, fifteen barrels, or one hundred and fifty barrels. Now I quite appreciate that owing to the wording of the telegraph form, that the government would not be liable for any such mistake, but I think that owing to the new order of things, that the government should make a system so perfect as to diminish the possibility of such mistakes, rather than put a premium on them. Under the present wording of the form, if through a mistake in transmission of a message, the sender suffers a serious loss, the government is not liable for any more than the amount of the cost of the message, and the operator is exempt from any blame in the matter. I say, sir, that the government ought to assume liability where it can be proved, that it was the fault of the operator who is incompetent, makes such a mistake, then the government is responsible for having given work to such a person.

Very serious losses have been suffered in the past by people who sent messages that were changed in transmission, and today with the market fluctuations, this is more likely to occur than ever before. I think, Sir, that instead of going back and reducing the liability that the Government, with a new department, which I hope will be so carried out, that the possibilities of mistakes will be diminished, ought to realize their responsibility, and when loss can be traced which is the fault of the operator, the Government should make good any loss that might occur. As to the increase of the registration fee, I think that is only right and proper. The Minister pointed out the need for the fifty-five hundred dollars which will be derived from the registration fee, and I hope that it will be usesful to him in carrying out the projects that I know that he has in view. He jokingly intimated that it would help to pay his salary, but I take that in the spirit in which it was offered, and I hope that he will get his increase, and regarding salaries, I hope that the Government will pay the heads of all departments a sufficient salary for the important work which they are doing. My experience in the past has been that we were paid a pittance for doing the most important work of the country. I don't believe that the people want these officials to work for less than a wage in proportion to their work.

I therefore want to express myself that in view of the inauguration of a new department, I regret that the Government should have found it necessary to lighten their responsibility by the introductiton of this section into the bill.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:— Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure every member of the Government appreciates the opinion expressed by Mr. Bennett, one of the members for St. John's West, when he so emphatically endorses the policy of the present Government in its creation of a Department of Posts and Telegraphs. From the observations which the hon. member and other members of the opposition have made during the past few weeks one would be led to conclude that the post office had been so highly organized and so efficiently run by the late Postmaster-General that improved reorganization and more efficient management were an impossibility. I am glad to note that in this matter, as also in the matter of the fish regulations, Mr. Bennett has changed his opinions and is now supporting the Government in its efforts to reorganize and improve postal and telegraph facilities in the Colony.

I am sure also that the entire House agrees with him in the opinions which he has just expressed on the matter of accuracy in telegraphic communication. It is a fact well known to every member of this chamber that the Postal Telegraph system has not reached to such a state of efficiency as to make it possible for the Government to issue an insurance policy with every telegraph message guaranteeing to indemnify the sender or the receiver, as the case may be, against any possibility of loss as a result of delays or inaccuracies in connection with the transmission and delivery of the telegraph message. During the past year, as will be seen from the Postal Department report recently tabled, there was a loss in operation of the Newfoundland Postal Telegraphs of more than $60,000. We all know that there are in the Island of Newfoundland very many telegraph offices which can never be regarded as paying propositions so far as telegraphy is concerned. At many of the offices there are junior and inexperienced officials and the salary which the services of these offices are worth, having regard to the volumne of business, does not justify payment importance of many of the offices cases does not justify the payment of as large a salary as is now paid, as is evidenced by the fact that there has been such a large loss on operations during the past year. It is necessary that these offices should be kept open for the general public welfare. Newfoundland is a shipping community, and it is highly desirable that telegraph offices should be scatterer all around our coast to aid shipping. In many sections mails ars exceedingly slow and at some seasons of the year the irregularity of mails is very great. The result is that it has been the policy of past administrations and is also the policy of this administration that, so far as possible, telegraph offices should be maintained in as many towns as possible, in spite of the fact that these telegraph offices cannot by any stretch of the imagination be regarded as a paying proposition. The past government, of which the Hon. Mr. Bennett was a member, felt, and this Government feels, that it is better to have a telegraph office in a town served by a very junior official who is not an expert telegraphist but who can manage to handle with reasonable despatch the small volume of business which is transacted at that office, than to have no office at the place. As a matter of public policy it is also desirable that there should be as many offices as possible. Certainly it is also desirable that every telegraph operator should be an efficient and capable official, but the manner. It would not be impossible and the volume of business transacted there are not such as to justify the public of the country in paying such a high-class official as would guarantee absolute accuracy in the receipt and despatch of telegrams.

It is just as well for us as a house to face the actual situation as it is, honestly and in a straightforward way to get high-class telegraph operators to work in such an office, because in many of these offices there is not a half hour's work per day, and an able, efficient and ambitious telegraph operator would not hold such an office, even though that operator were paid twice the salary that he could earn in a busy office, because for an industrious and capable person there is no work more trying than doing nothing. While the postal telegraph service does not pay as a business undertaking, yet from the standpoint of the entire colony and convenience of its people and the general advantages to trade, it does indirectly pay as a public utility, but no government would be justified in putting into a large number of the telegraph offices in this country such high-

ly-paid and efficient officials as the class of telegraph operators employed by the Anglo-American Telegraph Company, the Commercial Cable Company or other cable company at such offices as Heart's Content, Bay Roberts and Carbonear.

If the government had such a class of operators it might be practical for the government to stand behind telegraph messages and guarantee their accuracy in every detail, but if such were attempted the increased expenditure would be enormous and Mr. Bennett would be one of the very first to attack the government for attempting to apply highly expensive methods and machinery to a service the income of which alone does not warrant the expenditures already made. Such a procedure would be just as foolish as that of employing a five-ton truck to deliver a package of needles. It is the policy o fthe present administration to make the telegraph system throughout the country as accurate as possible to make it, having regard to the class of telegraph operators which it is possible for the government to employ in many of the smaller offices, the receipts of which are not sufficient to justify the existence of the office at all, but such offices should as a matter of public policy be kept open to deal with emergency cases, report shipping and handle the occasional commercial transaction requiring a despatch which could not otherwise be secured. It is the policy of the administration to open additional telegraph offices so that as the years go by the various sections of the Island will be less isolated and the people will have greater facilities, but as these offices are opened from time to time there is no hope that the revenue therefrom will be such as to justify the payment of an official of such experience and ability as would justify the people of the colony in guaranteeing that operator's accuracy. My hon. friend, who was for so many years colonial secretary, is well aware of the fact that when it is the intention of the postal department to open up a new office in some small town an experienced operator is sent to that town for a short period of time to give some young man or young woman living in the neighborhood a sufficient smattering of telegraphy to enable that person to handle at a very slow rate o fspeed the small volume of business to be transacted at that place. It frequently happens that as the years pass the volume of business increases, with the result that a more experienced and more highly paid operator is appointed to the post, but there are numerous cases in which young men and young women with but a few months' experience will be handling the small volume of business transacted at such minor offices, with the result that delays and inaccuracies may occur. To guarantee the prompt delivery of a telegraph message is under many circumstances in the outports of Newfoundland impracticable. For the purposes of economy it is impossible to employ a messenger, the telegraph operator is the postal official, telegraph operator and messenger. An effort has been made in the past and is being continued by the present administration to combine under one official in many places the post office and telegraph office for the purposes of public economy, as in many cases there is not enough actual business to be transacted in both offices to employ more than half the time of one official. Certainly my observations do not apply to the more import offices and to the places where there are frequent mail connections, but there are many offices in Newfoundland of the class to which I refer, and it is consequently impossible for the government that is for the taxpayers of the colony, to hold themselves responsible for in-

accuracies which might occur under such circumstances. The reason why the Anglo-American Telegraph Company have not any considerable number of offices throughout the country is because that company boasts of its accuracy, and unless there is a sufficient volume of business in a given locality to justify that company in paying a telegraph operator there whose accuracy can be assured, then no office is opened. Such a policy cannot be followed by the government in its postal telegraph system, because that system is not a business proposition, run as a money-making concern. It is an undertaking carried on at a financial loss, having regard to its own income, because of its importance to the colony as a public utility. The conditions under which each message is sent, which conditions must be signed by the sender, include a paragraph expressly relieving the government from liability for non-delivery, delays or inaccuracies in connection with any telegraph message to any amount over the cost of the message. This is not a new provision. Mr. Bennett knows that that provision has been on the postal telegraph form for a long time. As a matter of fact, when he was colonial secretary rules and regulations were made covering that very point, and stating that the government and the postal department were not liable except as above.

Doubts has arisen as to whether rules and regulations in that regard were legal, and it has been questioned as to whether the fact that the sender of the message signs such a declaration is legally binding upon the sender and receiver and does really relieve the postal department and the government from responsibility under certain circumstances. The late government and the postmaster-general, when these regulations were drafted by the postmaster-general and approved of by the late executive government, thought that that was so, but as doubts have arisen the present attorney-general has advised that the matter should be made quite clear by statute. This bill is consequently merely carrying out the decision of the late government put into effect by the late postmaster-general and approved of by Mr. Bennett himself. I would point out that even a commercial company such as the Anglo-American Telegraph Company, an organization whose telegraph officials have the efficiency and worth as telegraph operators which the large salaries which they receive demand, do not guarantee the accuracy of telegraph messages.

If my hon. friend would refer to the wording of the forms which he uses every day he will see that his attention is called to the fact that no guarantee whatever is given with respect to the accuracy of a telegraph message sent over Anglo lines until that message is repeated, which is done at half the cost o fthe original message, and even then the damages are limited to the sum of $50.00 unless a special valuation was put upon the message at the time it was sent. The criticisms of the honorable member are consequently entirely without foundation in fact. It is absurd for him to criticise the present administration for taking a retrograde step, because this step was taken by the late postmaster-general and approved of by Mr. Bennett himself. It was, in my opinion, a correct step. If commercial companies of the standing of the Anglo-American Telegraph Company which have trained officials receiving large salaries, do not guarantee accuracy of messages, then it is absurd to expect a guarantee from the Newfoundland Postal Telegraphs, which is not being run as a business undertaking and is necessarily staffed in many cases by junior officials, because the salaries paid are not such as

to justify the services of a highly trained and highly efficient operator. In offices like those in St. John's and the more important outport offices, the staff of the Postal Telegraphs is highly trained and efficient and messages received and transmitted by such officials are liable to no larger percentage of inaccuracies and delays than in any commercial telegraph company in the world, but it is impossible to extend such an assurance to telegraph messages received at and sent from small telegraph offices the total receipts of which may not amount to $20.00 a month.

I fear that Mr. Bennett was talking politics rather than sense when he criticised the government for not asking the taxpayers of this country to guarantee the accuracy of a message under such circumstances. He referred to an ideal state in which good telegraph lines with not too many offices on one line were efficiently maintained by a full and capable staff of line repairers, with offices manned by expert telegraphers. Such ideal conditions do not appertain in Newfoundland, and it will be many years before they do appertain. To make any attempt to put such a system into operation in Newfoundland would mean an enormous reduction in number of telegraph offices throughout the country. That was not the policy of the late administration, of which Mr. Bennett was a member, nor is it the policy of this administration.

I am pleased to note that the other sections of the bill have the support of the hon. members of the opposition, namely, that the registration fee be increased from three cents to five cents and also that there should be a delivery charge of five cents on each foreign package containing dutiable goods. The present registration fee of three cents is not sufficient to cover the cost of the registration branch of the postal service. Still less it is capable of carrying the postal guarantee to refund the loser of any registered letter the value of the letter up to a maximum of $10.00. The volume of foreign parcel post business in very considerable. During recent years the increase has been rapid. A five cents delivery tax is a very small charge, can easily be paid by each person who imports dutiable goods and helps to defray the cost of handling the package.

DR. JONES:—Mr. Chairman, I understand clearly the reason for limiting the liability of the government in this matter, because if all messages that were missent, or incorrectly sent; if the government were to assume liability for all these then it would break the Government. But I think that there should be some means adopted by which these errors would be overcome. I would suggest to the postmaster-general that he should have a sort of check system, whereby when a message is received, a report is sent in to the department by the receiving operator, giving the time it was delivered. This should be simple, and it would be effective. I know of many cases where telegrams have been two days on the way, and have been lying for hours in one of the offices. I think it would simplify matters if a report was sent in, and if there was a delay, the reason for the delay given. I have had telegrams delayed two days, and when I inquired why, the only satisfaction I got was that the line was out of order, and I think that system would eliminate a lot of the trouble in this connection. I suggest this to the minister, and ask him to give it his consideration.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Chairman, I would like to correct the impression which Mr. Bennett has given the house, that this bill is a re-

trograde movement on the part of the Government. That is not so. We are trying to legalise the rules and regulations that were made by the late postmaster-general. The Postal Telegraph Act contains in Section 8 the following provisions: (Reads provisions). The late post-master-general represented that the government should not be liable for any error in the transmission of any message, in the non-delivery of a message, or delayed delivery of a message, and he advised that rules and regulations tc that effect be published in The Royal Gazette two years ago. When it was brought to my notice. as Attorney General, I came to the conclusion that the postmaster-general under the provisions of Section 118, Consolidated Statutes, had no power to make such regulations, saying that the Government would not be liable for any loss caused by error in transmission or delay, and now, I thought it best to advise the present minister to legalise the regulations made by the late postmaster-general and approved of by the late executive government, and the statement that this is a retrograde movement is not borne out by the facts, and it was only because they were not legal that I suggested to the present minister to have them legalised.

Mr. BENNETT—Mr. Chairman, the hon. the minister of justice has said that I misunderstood the position with regard to the Postal Telegraph department. I wish to inform the house that I did not misunderstand the position. I realise that under conditions laid down, that the government is exempt from any liability for errors in the transmission of messages. As to whether they would stand in law is a matter for a legal mind to decide, but I want to point out that with the establishment of a new department the opening of new offices in such places as outlined by the hon. the prime minister, where the revenue was not sufficient to permit the engagement of competent operators, but times are changing, we see men starting in new lines of business, establishing themselves in the different parts of the Island, and the importance of telegraph offices is greater than ever before.

Efficiency and accuracy is absolutely essential to the people in carrying on of all business. I would suggest to the minister, if at all possible, to have all those smaller offices in certain sections linked up by telephones, that is, where you have a centre with an efficient and capable operator in charge so that you could speak from the one station to any particular locality. But in view of the fact that the department has no funds and that there is no policy like this in contemplation for outport offices, is it not worth while considering. It is a serious matter and going to be more serious as years go by, and I think that the policy of the past has been a mistake. We have in the past been too ready to accede to the wishes of the different districts to open telegraph offices. The whole position is bristling with difficulties. Money is the greatest factor and it is necessary to have to pay for efficient help. I think that some policy should be evolved so that all messages passing over the lines could be carefully and cautiously checked with a view to eliminating inaccuracies.

MR. FOX—Mr. Speaker, naturally I am in support of the resolutions as a whole, but I doubt whether the government can go as far as they liked, under this section (1), and escape all liability, under the circumstances; and I doubt the wisdom of operating the Postal Telegraph lines differently than those operated by the Western Union and Anglo Companies. We

have the statement of the prime minister himself that in several outports the Postal Telegraphs are operated by inexperienced, inefficient and underpaid operators to do the business entrusted to them by the public. This is certainly a nice state of affairs, considering the important messages and the risks that have to pass through the hands of such inefficient operators. If that is the way the Postal Telegraphs department intends to continue to do business, it is just as well for them to shut up show now. I fear that as we are going to have a new contract, with far more restrictions, to attempt to operate the lines under it, that we are going to have more business than in the past. We know that the Western Union and Anglo Companies have enjoyed the cream of the business in this country, and we cannot afford to escape all liability and jog along with an efficient service, but rather adopt remedial measures with a view towards establishing more efficiency in this very necessary public department. For example there have been cases brought under my notice where in doubt was cast upon the secrecy of messages that passed through the telegraph offices, and it is only another indication that the business of the Postal Telegraph department is not run as it should be.

Now, I think, that before we attempt to set up the position that the Postal Telegraphs, admittedly inefficient, is going to have the strictest contract in the country, that we ought have a contract, at all events, under which all other companies are operated, because the result is going to have the strictest contract in the country, that we ought have a contract, at all events, under which all other companies are operated, because the result is going to be that we are going to have far more business to do. I think that we ought not be content with complacently admitting the fact that our telegraphs are being inefficiently handled and that we ought, if we are going to provide the outharbors with postal telegraph offices, see that hey are efficiently manned and capable of transmitting messages in an efficient manner. Because, after all, the life of trade depends upon the staff of any particular office. I should think that when this contract is attempted to be formed, under which an attempt will be made to lessen the liability of the government, that we ought not go outside the terms of the ordinary contract provided by the other telegraph companies; and in particular we ought see that the officials provided for the department are up to that stage where the public can depend upon the department for the efficient service required from it.

In connection with sections two and three of these resolutions, may I ask the minister how far this will increase all postal rates, and does it interfere with the international or universal regulations?

MINISTER OF POSTS & TELEGRAPHS—It does not interfere whatever.

MR. FOX—But dealing with the stamp fees, are they not analagous with the universal?

MINISTER OF POSTS & TELEGRAPHS—We will bring in an act to cover that.

MR. FOX—Now as regards the registration fees I would like to ask what is the value of registration in this country. The only value that I know of is that the registered letter gives the tip to any person who wants to rob from the post office. I know of certain cases where letters, arising out of registration, never reached their destination. I have had occasion in the past to send money in

the form of bills from remote outharbours to St. John's, and, rather than register them and draw the attention of a would-be thief to them, I put them in an envelope and hardly took the trouble to seal it properly. The precaution only means more trouble for anybody because, I understand, that the mere fact of registration guarantees nothing, beyond the protection of ten dollars. Thus there is no liability on the postal department beyond seeing that there is a hand check on the mail. I know a case in which four hundred dollars was sent by a poor woman from an outharbor to St. John's and that is the last she ever heard of it. I think that particular attention should be given to the more efficient carrying out of the registration system. No benefit is derived from the fact that we are charged more for it. You get no returns, but rather you increase the risk. If there is a hand check why not enforce regulations that will perfect the hand check and guarantee the accuracy of any registered mail so that it will be received and delivered properly. I draw these matters to the attention of the minister, particularly the necessity of the efficiency of the telegraph offices. Unfortunately there has been a looseness in the past as regards the privacy of the business transacted. I would suggest that he tighten up the whole system and guarantee above all else the secrecy of the department.

MINISTER OF POSTS & TELEGRAPHS—Mr. Speaker, I quite appreciate the remarks that have been made by the members for St. John's East and West, but, really in justice to the Postal Telegraphs department. I cannot admit that there is greater inefficiency in the department than in the Anglo offices. My short experience with the department is that our number of mistakes were not as great as the Anglo's. The inefficiency is not altogether caused by inefficient operators in outports. Perhaps the most experienced and most reputable operator may sometimes make an error, because we have traced one or two errors to head office here, the work of supposedly efficient operators.

I quite appreciate that under the conditions that have obtained in Newfoundland and is obtaining, not only in connection with the Postal Telegraph department, but in all our departments, it is almost impossible to get an efficient service, because there are too much politics in connection with appointments in the civil service. When a position of trust is opened it is not the competent official who gets the appointment, but the person that may be incompetent and who has greater pull with some politician. That is what I have been trying to impress upon my colleagues and I take occasion to mention it now to our friends opposite, although, perhaps, they are not in a similar position just now as they are not in power, as their recommendations now would not have the same weight as coming from the government side Now that is what we have to guard against and I do not see that I should do in that connection any better than has been done in the past, because no matter what opinion I may have as regards the appointment of efficient officials, one is up against importunities and political needs of colleagues. As long as you are up against party politics and political expediency conditions will become no better.

With regard to the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Fox, namely, that the business of the Anglo is carried on with greater efficiency than by the Postal Telegraphs, I think that our business is carried on just as good, but the reason is that the Anglo do a much larger business. If you want to send

a message outside this countrw direct you got to go to the Anglo, because the Postal cannot send it since the Commercial Cable Company got out This is a most unfortunate circumstance and we have lost considerable revenue on that account and we are trying to remedy it as much as possible. I quite appreciate that a retrogressive step is detrimental to all concerned to have our liability lessened by statute, but it will not in any way tend to lessen the courtesy on the aprt of the Postal Department.

HON. MINISTER POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS.—Of course we are anxious to make the service of the department as perfect as possible and as has been pointed out by the hon. member for St. John's West Mr. Bennett, that owing to the fact that the population of the Dominion is so scattered there is a very great difficulty in giving facilities for the conduct of the business, and also it is hard to get good work done because of the small salaries. With regard to the telephones, no matter how efficient the employees may be, mistakes are likely to be made in the transmission of the messages. There is always the danger of mistakes being made in the transmission of the messages from one place to another but nevertheless the telephone system is appreciated and the four or five telephone offices we have down Smith Sound, T.B., are working satisfactorily, and even when the operators are most efficient mistakes are bound tc occur. It is our desire to make the service as perfect as possible. I am glad to be able to take note of the suggestion made by Dr. Jones and it may be helpful in getting operators more attentive to their business, and I will accept any suggestion which may cause improvements. The operators no doubt find their work monotonous and may sometimes leave their office longer than they should consequently messages are unduly delayed in delivery. We hope to have this remedied.

MR. HIGGINS:—I do not intend to delay the committee but this is essentially a subject of importance and I appreciate the position the Honorable Minister finds himself in. I am fully in accord with the desire to see the most efficient service possible created. The point I take it of those on this side in offering a word of criticism is in the nature of drawing the attention of the Minister who is primarily the person responsible for the drafting of the resolutions ,to the necessity that the Minister ought to make the regulations as reasonable as possible. I view the matter of the Posts and Telegraphs of the Colony as a matter of quasi utility and commercial enterprise combined, and in other words the immediate idea in having Government control of the telegraph system is that the interests of the country apart from looking upon the commercial interests can be best looked after and the Government of the day may at their wish make any alteratio nor extension. Of course there is a difference between that class of organization and the other organizations that operate here. I agree with the idea that we must of necessity accept the difference. It is peculiar that you will not get out of the people who work under the control of the State the same efficient service as you will derive from a private organization, and for that reason there is sure to be an amount of difficulty experienced and some effort ought to be made to do as good as our competitors. I take it that the idea has been to encourage business people to trust their own service, and I think wherever possible we should try to make it a point that whatever business we have ought to be done through our own service and not the Anglo and that is our duty, and in

supporting this I hope the service will warrant the support of the people. I also take the point raised by my colleague Mr. Fox, in drawing the attention of the Minister that under this section the legislation enacted shall not go into force until the next session of the legislature and then only when it has been laid before both Houses within fourteen days after it has been completed, and if not complete during this session well they may be next year. So we shall be able to see that regulations shall be as reasonable as possible. I do ask that the contract be nearly as good as that of our competitors and endeavour to give the public as good a contract as possible and as long as that is being done there will not be very much difficulty. But I think we ought to recognize that some difficulty will be met with as long as the operators are poorly paid and as long as we have State control we are not going to have as good a service as we might otherwise get. I also wish to refer to the question of the safety of registered letters and it is unfortunately a fact and a sad thing that registered letter larcenies are prevalent. And I do hope that some system will be devised by the Hon. Minister whereby he will try to restore the confidence of the public in that branch of the service.

But it is an undeniable fact that registered letters offer no security and the only value now of them is that one is enabled to have his letter traced but beyond that there is no value in having a letter registered. Really that was the intention when the act was originally brought in here. From my long experience I know that the Minister in this matter is going to have an up-hill task. I only make these remarks to remind the House of the difficulty the Minister is at all times laboring under when the system is under State control, but I do want to see as efficient service given to the people as is possible and make the competition with the other systems as reasonable as possible. Personally, in light of my long knowledge of the postal service, I do not find anything objectionable in the resolutions.

MR. BENNETT:—I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs if the work of the Government is still being done by the Anglo and if any steps have been taken by the Government to have connection with Canso Station?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS:—I may say that this matter is receiving the attention of the Government at the present time. Some meetings have been held at which deputations from the Anglo have attended and that we are trying to do something to open up that connection.

MR. MacDONNELL:—In connection with registered letters, I wish to make the suggesttion that the Department of Posts should the money orders in this way, that an order for more than fifty dollars ought to be allowed. Fifty dollars is the greatest amount one can remit by money order at present. If you want to send two hundred dollars it will cost you more than you would pay if you could get an order for two hundred. At the present time the largest amount of money that can be sent on a money order is $50.00. I would suggest as one way out of the difficulty that the amount that can be sent on one money order be considerably increased.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS:—Mr. Speaker, I quite appreciate the remarks that have been made by the members for St. John's East and West, but really in justice to the Postal Telegraphs Department, I cannot admit that there is greater efficiency in the department than in the Anglo offices. My short experience with the department is that our number of mistakes are not as great as the

Anglo's. The inefficiency is not altogether caused by inexperienced operators in the outports. Perhaps the most experienced and most reputable operator may sometimes make an error, because we have traced one or two errors to the head office, the work of supposedly efficient operators.

I quite appreciate that under the conditions that have obtained in Newfoundland, not only in connection with the Postal Telegraph Department, but in all our departments, it is almost impossible to get an efficient service, because there are too much politics in connection with appointments in the civil service. When a position of trust is opened it is not always the competent official who gets the appointment, but the person that may be less competent but who has greater pull with some politician. That is what I have been trying to impress upon my colleagues and I take occasion to mention it now to our friends opposite. Now that is what we have to guard against. As long as you are up against party politics and political expediency conditions will become no better.

With regard to the remarks of Mr. Fox, namely, that the business of the Anglo is carried on with greater efficiency than by the Postal Telegraphs, I think that our business is carried on just as good, but the reason the Anglo do a much larger business is because we have no cable communication. If you want to send a message outside this country you must go to the Anglo, because the Postal cannot send a message since we discontinued business with the Commercial Cable Company. This is a most unfortunate circumstance and we have lost considerable revenue on that account and we are trying to remedy it as much as possible.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The chairman from the committee reported, that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed the resolutions without amendment, and recommended that a bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

On motion this report was received and adopted and the bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Postal and Telegraph Services" was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Encouragement of Agriculture,'" 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 amendment of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider the bill entitled "An Act Respecting the issue of Certain Debenture Bonds of the Colony."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Scammell 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 an dadopted and it was ordered that the said bill be read a third time on tomorrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries ,the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider the bill entitled "An Act to Regulate the Exportation of Salt Codfish."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Scammell took the chair of committee.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—Mr. Chairman, I do not think that any serious attempt is being made to cope with the salt situation, for if we have to wait ten days for something to be done and at the end of that time find that the only thing accomplished has been the sending of a message to the Secretary of State conditions are indeed in a bad way. Only today I sent to one of our importers for a hundred hogsheads of salt to send to my district and that man begged me to take only fifty hogsheads, and there is not a hundred hogsheads of salt today in that very place, and the same thing applies to the majority of the other places in town. The statement is being made that there is more salt here than there really is, but that is not going to help us in the least; it is just as well for people to know just what they have to contend with. If the Green Bay vessels and the schooners from Trinity Bay and other places should strike in here there would not be a grain of salt left in the city within six or eight days, and these vessels have to ocme here for their supplies so you will see that the only reason why we have any salt at all left today is because the ice is to the northward.

Now does the Government think for one moment that they are doing what they ought to do in this matter or do they think that in their failure to deal with a situation as grave as this that they are playing fair to the people who put them here. Despite the fact that this danger which threatens us has been pointed out to them in all its seriousness, they make absolutely no attempt whatever to do anything beyond havings Bowrings send a message to their people in Liverpool a day or two ago. I have never heard of such way in which the opposition press are unparrelled hypocricy. I admit that the Government are not to blame for the strike in Cadiz, but if the matter had been attended to at the proper time this trouble could have been averted.

I met a prominent exporter to-day (it was not Hon. Walter Baine Grieve either) who told me that here was not enough salt in the city for Placentia Bay, and he knew what he was talking about. What I say is that if the government did not take seriously what I said with regard to the salt situation, they at least ought to have taken the miniser of marine and fisheries at his word when he admitted that the situation was serious but not quite so bad as I had described it, but evidently they have ignored both warnings because there is nothing here whatever to prove that we are going to get a load of salt within the next twenty or thirty days, if we except the message of Bowring Bros. and the request to Sir Edgar Bowring to give what help he can, and worse still. it is only a day or two since that message was sent. Now if they had even done that much the day after I spoke on the matter, there might be some sympathy for them and it would have shown some anxiety or at least willingness on their part to do something. If we get no salt now the government are to blame, and if there is no salt there will be no fish, in which case we will not need to worry ourselves about motor roads or any other kind of roads.

I want to suggest to the government not to pay any attention whatever to exporters, to ignore them in this matter completely, but get down to hard pans and send a good man to Cadiz from England, if necessary, but for goodness sake take the thing seriously and make some effort to avert the disastrous results that must ensue from any further inactivity on their part. The minister of marine and fisheries knows as well as I do that Liverpool salt is absolutely unfit for our requirements, and instead of try-

ing to secure salt from there an effort should be made in some other direction. Send a steamer to Turk's Island and get salt. My idea is not to critcise the government in anything they may be trying to do. I am serious in what I say with regard to the gravity of our position I see the hon. minister of finance and customs smiling I have been watching the smile coming over his face for some time, but this is no joke and he might have reason to cry before we get through with the consequences of the Government's neglect in this matter. The Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows that the situation is serious, the Prime Minister admitted yesterday that it was serious, and eery hon. member of this House must see it. If the Cadiz strike continues, where are we going to be? And to say in the face of all this that after a warning of what was bound to happen if something was not done immediately, messages are sent out on the 25th and 27th, the latter only today, surely something must be lacking. I want to pass this priate message back to the Phime Minister and in doing so I would say to him and his Government that they should not hesitate to send twenty-five messages like that if they would produce the desired results. It is a matter that we are all in sympathy with, and if I knew at this moment how I could assist in this crisis, I would have no hesitation whatever in offering my help.

I would suggest that the Government try to get a steamer in New York, Halifax or anywhere they can get one and send her to Turk's Island for a cargo of salt even if it does cost a little more. It is no longer a matter of cost and the fishermen must have the salt if it is to be got. If fishermen want 200 hobsheads of salt to go to Labrador, it is no use, as my han. friend Captain Jones knows, for them to put a hundred hogsheads aboard their vessel because they know they have only enough for half a voyage, and they cannot come back for more when that is used.

I repeat that no one knows how long the strike in Cadiz is going to last, and again I enter the plea on behalf of the country that the Government lose no more time in availing of every means at their disposal to secure a sufficient supply of salt to see the fishermen over the season.

MR. BENNETT:—Mr. Chairman, just a word in reference to the statement of Sir John Crosbie wherein he referred to the fact that a certain section of the press having reported that the fishery export resolutions passed this House unanimously. That statement by the press was hardly correct. We on this side of the House discussed the resolutions fully and criticized them, and while the Leader of the Opposition practically endorsed them, there were sections which neither he nor anyone else on this side was in favor of. We knew, however, that the Government meant to put the resolutions through no matter what objections were raised and that it would be futile for us to argue the thing further, but we did succeed in having an amendment, moved I think by Mr. Fox, added and when that was accomplished we felt that something had been done to improve the resolutions because it gave the exporters a chance to consult with the exportation board before any definite action was decided upon in the autumn.

I agree with what Sir John Crosbie up their minds to put the resolution through and we criticized them according to our light, and finding nothing further could be done, decided to let them pass amended.

I want to put myself on record that I do not agree with the regulations in their entirely. I agree that regulations of some kind are necessary, and I agree with some of the sections, but I

don't want it understood that in voting for these regulations, that I endorsed them in their entirety.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Chairman, I rise to my place this evening to endorse the appeal that has been made by Sir John Crosbie, with regard to the salt question, and with him, I am ready to give any assistance, that may be in my power, in this matter, so that we will not be placed with the conditions that he has referred to. Not only should we use every means in our power to prevent this catastrophe, but we should see to it that the stocks of salt at present in this city, and in this country, are not sold at a higher price. This is one of the foremost planks in the government platform, to see that profiteering was not allowed to continue. There has not been any importation of salt in the last month, and I know of a case where arrangements were made by planters in the district of Placentia and St. Mary's, to buy salt at a certain figure, and a day or two ago they found that salt had already advanced thirty cents per hogshead. We have no indication that it will not advance another dollar, and it is the bounden duty of the house to put a stop to this. If they are going to hold the support of the country, they must protect the interests of the fishermen, and in protecting the fisermen you are protecting the interests of every individual in the country. As has been so well said by hon. members in this house, the whole country is dependent upon the fishery for existence. I think that it is a lamentable state of affairs after the warning that he gave ten days ago, for Sir John Crosbie to have to get up, and make the statement he has made here to-day, and I am sure that nobody will question his knowledge of the conditions.

I want to endorse the appeal that has been made by him to the government to put into action the machinery that will prevent a state of affairs, coming to pass, that may be ruinous to our very existence. I don't offer this as a criticism, and I have no desire to hamper the government. There is one that will be prouder next fall to know that the government made good as to the salt situation. We are facing a situation to-day that we never had to face before. We are paying higher prices for everything to-day than we ever paid before, and for these reasons we should make an honest attempt to see that at least the fishermen, who are going to the fishery, will not be hampered by a lack of salt. Sir John Crosbie has stated that the salt you can get at Liverpool is not as good as it might be, but that it will serve the purpose. I do not pretend to know as much about this as he does, but I am prepared to accept his statement, and if you cannot get salt where you are negotiating for it with the high commissioner in London, why not dispatch the best possible man you can get, where you can get it, even if it cost ten thousand dollars. It would be better to spend ten thousand dollars to prevent this disaster which threatens us, than to come in here and grant that amount for purposes which are not so important. I merely throw these suggestions out, in the hope that some that is taking place with regard to salt this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The chairman from the committee reports that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the bill with some amendment.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the bill entitled "An Act to amend 'The Business Profits Tax Act, 1917,'" was read a second time and

ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole house on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. Minister of Justice, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Montreal Trust Co.," was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole house on to-morrow.

Purusuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to amend Cap. X of 9-10 Geo. V entitled 'An Act with respect to existing Tenancies and Ejectment therefrom,'" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole house on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the bill entitled "An Act respecting Licenses to Cut Hardwood" was read a second time, and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole house on to-morrow.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that this bill be now read a second time. It is a well known fact that the country contains a considerable quantity of birch and witch hazel timber. This timber is largely used in connection with the important shipbuilding industry of the country. When a license is given to cut timber under the Crown Lands' Act that license gives the right to cut all timber on land subject to the license. This bill provides that the Governor-in-Council may under certain circumstances grant the right to cut birch and witch hazel only over ungranted crown lands. Certainly it does not confer the right upon the government to grant any such license with respect to timber areas already held under the Crown Lands' Act, but all areas over which private individuals have not secured rights may under this bill be subject to special birch and witch hazel timber cutting licenses. The necessity for this bill arises because of the fact that certain capitalists are prepared to invest large sums of money in the erection of veneer mills. It has been found that Newfoundland birch and witch hazel are most suitable woods for use of veneer. This industry has already been substantially developed because of the progressive business ability of Messrs. Dawe of Bay Roberts. It is their intention to consider the extension of their operations, and it is quite probable that other capitalists are engaged in similar undertakings throughout the country. The bill provides that the applicant shall satisfy the governor in council that he is prepared to establish a factory for the manufacture of veneer and give to the governor-in-council satisfactory proof that he is financially able to carry out the enterprise. No trees of less diameter at the base than eight inches may be cut under licenses under this act. The power to make rules and regulations is vested in the governor-in-council. This is the development of an entirely new enterprise, and I am sure will receive the endorsation of the house.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Is it the intention to cut this wood on all crown lands?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—The bill makes it possible for the governor-in-council to grant licenses with respect to all crown lands and that includes what is commonly known as the three-mile limit. The governor-in-council would, however, in its discretion, see that licenses were not granted respecting the three-mile limit under circumstances as to interfere with the use of the three-mile limit by the fishermen for shipbuilding purposes.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—While granting those privileges you should be prepared to see that the fishermen are protected and people may go in and mow down the three-mile limit indiscrimin-

ately, besides there is a shortage just now of witch hazel and juniper. That is the only objection I have to the 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 Judicature Act," 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 provide for the Standardization of Codfish" with some amendments, in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion the said amendments were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

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

The house then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, May 28th, 1920.

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

Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs tabled the Customs returns, 1918-1919.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table a report of customs for the year ending 1919.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from St. Bride's for a road from St. Bride's to Cape St. Mary's, and from Cape St. Mary's to Lear's Cove, in all about six miles. There is a road now part of the way, but a large part of the distance is unmarked. The people of Fox Harbor and from other places in Placentia Bay have to use this road. They have been asking for this from year to year but nothing has been done. There is also the fact that wrecks occur along this coast and the men cannot find their way to where any people live. I hope, sir, that this petition will receive the careful consideration of the government.

MR. SINNOTT:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to support the prayer of this petition.

MR. GOSSE:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present six petitions representing 431 voters of Harbor Grace District for a moderation of the Prohibition Act.

MR. BENNETT:—To ask the Hon. Colonial Secretary in the absence of the Minister of the Minister of Militia to lay on the table of the house a statement of all monies paid through the Militia Department to the Board of Review on separation allowances from the 15th November, 1919, to the present date giving the names of those comprising said board and the amount paid to each member, also number of claims considered during the above period.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Tabled this report.

Committee of the whole on bill entitled "An Act to amend the Profits Tax Act of 1917."

On motion the house resolved itself into committee of the whole on this bill.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of committee.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—In section two I would like to make a slight alteration in the reading by striking out the word "pay" and substituting therefor the word "optional" and the word "second" for "first," and by striking out the words "said bank or banking corporation" and substituting the word "minister." The object of this is to

have the option with the Minister instead of with the Bank.

The committee rose and reported that they had passed the bill without amendment.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the amendments made by the legislative council in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to provide for the Standardization of Codfish" were read a second time and concurred in and it was ordered that a message be sent to the legislative council acquainting that body that the said amendments had been agreed to without amendment.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the issue of certain Debenture Bonds 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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the Bill entitled "An Act to regulate the Exportation of Salt Codfish" 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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to amend 'The Business Profits Tax Act, 1917.'"

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The chairman from the committee reported that they had considered the bill with some amendment.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider the bill entitled "An Act to amend Cap. X of 9-10 Geo. V entitled 'An Act with respect to Existing Tenancies and Ejectment therefrom.'"

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The chairman from the committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the bill without amendment.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the bill entitled "An Act respecting the Preservation of Beavers" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole house on to-morrow.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—The object of this bill is to permit the killing of Beavers in certain sections of the country where beaver are very numerous. The government has taken up the matter with the Game Board and they have the killing of beavers allowed in certain sections under regulations prepared by the Game Board and submitted to governor-in-council and made law. There is no intention to allow the public to kill all they like. There are some sections that are teeming with beavers, but other sections must be protected. Trappers will receive licenses that will be good for a certain section of the country and for a certain time. There will be a limited number and nobody

will probably be allowed to kill more than fifty. These will be sold at a price fixed by the Game Board and will therefore be under the sole control of the board. In America to-day great prices are being received for beavers. They will be exported by the Game Board who will also be the sole exporters. The profits received will go towards a fund of compulsory state insurance.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—I would like to know from the minister how he is going to protect the beaver in the future? What means he is going to adopt to prevent them from being wiped out altogether, and whether he is going to compel a man to sell beaver skins to the Marine and Fisheries Department at his figure? Will not the figure depend upon the value of the skins in the foreign markets? The houses of the beavers are known to trappers all over the country, and when this bill goes through, there will be a general rush for licenses, and beavers will be wiped out, and while we know that they are a nuisance in certain sections of the country, still they are an asset to the country, and should not be allowed to be exterminated.

HON. THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—The points raised by the leader of the opposition are very important ones, and ones which will receive a lot of thought. When these regulations come in force, with the approval of the Game Board all of them will be based upon the points raised by him. We will have some one to look after it, and see that they are not interfered with in their houses. It is not the intention of the government to allow them to be exterminated. Beavers will be given all possible protection. We must protect them as much as possible in order to have a regular revenue from that source. Only a certain number will be allowed to be killed. Licenses will be given only to bona fide trappers. The beavers are very numerous at present in certain parts of the country, and the skins are very valuable, and it would be a pity if the government could not use this as a source of revenue, but I can assure you, that every precaution will be taken for their protection.

The government proposes shortly to appoint a commission and their duty will be to consider the advisability of establishing a state insurance scheme for this colony. It is a matter that has received much attention, but it will involve a large expenditure, and we thought it best to delay this Bill until next year, and then to appoint two or three men to consider the matter carefully, and recommend a scheme that may be made law. In a general sense this scheme will include the men from the age of eighteen to sixty. I hope that this commission will be appointed within a month or so, and by the time that we meet here again that we will have a bill to cover these suggestions, and that we will get a sufficient profit off the sale of beaver skins, to help us to carry out this state insurance scheme, without asking the treasury for too much assistance. This scheme is one that we have given a great deal of thought to in the Fishermen's Protective Union, because we thought for many years that there should be such a scheme, and from the consideration that we have given it, we think the insurance could be given to the amount of five hundred dollars on each life, for a premium to be paid of about five dollars for men from the age of eighteen to thirty, and in no case should it exceed ten dollars for men of 60. This five hundred dollars will be paid to them when they reach the age of seventy-five years. That is the general idea of the scheme, and we want the profit on the sale of beaver skins to be devoted to that purpose.

MR. MOORE:—Do I understand

from the minister that the beaver skins must be sold to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries Department.

HON. THE MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—Yes. All beaver skins must be sold to the Marine and Fisheries Department.

MR. BENNETT:—Mr. Speaker, I quite appreciate the position taken by the minister with regard to the disposal of beaver skins. I know that this matter has been given a great deal of attention by the game board. I don't know just what has transpired recently because I have not attended any meeting for some time, but many suggestions have been made as to the best way of getting this matter cleared up. I must agree with the leader of the opposition that there will be great difficulty, with regard to licenses, and it will be hard to discriminate. The thought suggests itself to me, that the game board should take this matter entirely in their own hands. They have preserved the beaver successfully in this country for the past fifteen years, and it would not be fair to let any number of men, who call themselves trappers, reap the harvest sown. The suggestion that recommends itself to my mind is to let the game board take control of this matter, and send out wardens to kill a certain number of beavers each year, and the government will get the full profit on the skins. This especially recommends itself to me, because of the object to which this fund will be devoted. I don't think that any section of the country will find fault with this means of helping the state insurance scheme. It is a policy that will benefit the whole country. The best way to protect the beaver is to put the killing under control of some government department, under the supervision of the superintendent of the game board, and then there will be no danger of their being wiped out. As has been said beaver skins are very valuable now, and the revenue from this source will be a great help towards the state insurance scheme suggested.

I hold in my hand a letter which I received a few days ago from a gentleman in town who is evidently very much interested in this matter and for the benefit of the house I will read the letter, as it might commend itself to the consideration of the hon. minister.

(Reads letter).

This, I think, is a new departure regarding wild animals and appears to me to be very reasonable, and I think that it expresses the opinions generally held as to open seasons for beavers. I know that past governments each year advocated the extension of close seasons, their reasons being that they were very much in dread the killing of those animals, which are absolutely helpless. The indiscriminate killing of beavers, if permissible, would be like the slaughtering of whitecoats—by the thousands—and ere long result in the complete extermination of those very valuable animals. Whilst allowing the killing of beavers to a limited extent, I think we ought to encourage the preservation of them at the same time, in order that we might continue to get the best returns, particularly as the money to be derived therefrom is to be appropriated to that laudable purpose already mentioned.

MR. SCAMMELL:—Mr. Speaker, with the problem exception of the district of St. George's I do not suppose that there is a district in the island where beavers are as plentiful as they are in the district of St. Barbe, which district I have the honor to represent. When campaigning last year this was one of the subjects brought under my notice very frequently, and although throughout the district as a whole beavers are not plentiful, yet there are certain sections in it where they are exceedingly plentiful, particularly in the areas from Parsons' Pond to

Flower's Cove, around the vicinity of Hare Bay and around White Bay. I welcome this bill chiefly for the reason that I have in my district a large number of people who are not in the best of circumstances and who could augment their incomes considerably through the killing of beavers if permitted to do so. The restrictions placed upon the killing of beaver for many years past have caused a great deal of hardship to those people. I think, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of those people in St. Barbe to whom I refer, that if they can find a way to add an extra honest dollar to their income that they ought to be allowed to do it.

Now, we may hold divergent views as to the advisability of killing beaver. The object of the bill, as I take it, is to carry out the wishes of the majority of the people, and the majority of the people at least in my district are anxious to see and very much desire the capturing of beaver. I was talking to a man at Port aux Choix last year on this subject, and he told me that beaver had become unprecedently numerous in the district. Speaking of one place, he said, people used to cut seven loads (or tons) of hay there, but owing to the increase of beaver causing the rivers to be dammed and flooding the land, only three or four hundred-weight was obtained instead of seven tons. As a matter of fact beaver have become a nuisance in these areas where they are numerous.

Then again it is a much discussed question as to whether or not beaver exterminate themselves automatically. There is a Micmac Indian by the name of Matthew Mitchell who is probably known to the hon. member for St. George's. Well this Indian holds an affirmative contention on this point. In support of his theory he has stated that in roaming around the country, and he has travelled extensively in the interior, that he not infrequently picked up the teeth of beaver. He was not prepared to say whether or not they shed their teeth, but he seemed strongly inclined to advance the argument that these animals outlived their existence after ten years; in other words they died automatically. I think if that theory is a fact that we are not very wrong in regulating the killing of beaver.

I must support the bill because it is going to mean some extra dollars in the pockets of people who need it so much, and when the prescribed areas over which the beaver shall be hunted are being discussed by the Governor in Council, I shall do my best to see that the beaver areas in my district are included in them. These are the reasons why I am in accord with this bill.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Speaker, I don't think that there can be any disagreement regarding the object of this bill, State Insurance, but I think the minister himself will admit that is a bill that will require a great deal of thought and a certain amount of amendment. I think it is a wise move on the part of the government to introduce state insurance, and I have no intention of opposing this movement, but at the same time it is one that a lot can be said for and against. We realize that the object of this bill is a bona fide one, and I don't think that it will meet with any opposition, apart from any amendment that might be asked.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—Mr. Speaker, there is one thing I would like to mention in connection with this matter and that is this: It is generally reported, and I think with a great deal of truth, that there are a large number of beaver skins, which were taken during close season and contrary to law and held in stock by the owners who were awaiting for an open season in order to put them on the market. I would like to know what steps the Game Board would take against the

marketing of those pelts, as I think that there should be some safeguard to protect the men who intend to hunt beavers, according to law.

It is quite true that in some sections of the country beavers are numerous. I remember hearing people in Hall's Bay say last fall that beavers were numerous there. If at all possible, those men who have been guilty of illicit hunting should be watched and the skins put on the market properly examined to determine the length of time since they have been killed.

MR. MacDONNELL:—Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this bill. As has been mentioned by the hon. member for St. Barbe, beavers are more plentiful in the district of St. George's than in any other part of the country. I remember about a year ago around Grand Lake seeing 150 beavers or more. They gave all sorts of trouble to railroad men in that section by damming the small rivers over night. Going straight up the main river one of the section foremen up there had quite a field of oats destroyed the year before last owing to beaver dams.

I believe that the time is come when the trapper should be permitted to kill a certain number of beaver, but I think that the idea of this bill that there is to be a price fixed which will be a source of revenue to the government is a step in the wrong direction, for the reason which I dare say is no secret to any member in this house, that at the present time a certain portion of beavers are killed every year and smuggled out of this country. Well, if, as is stated here in the bill, the Department of Marine and Fisheries are to be the sole purchasers and exporters of beaver skins and the department expects to get a certain amount of revenue therefrom, that simply means that the department wants to buy from the trapper at less than the market price. That, in my opinion, is a direct incentive to men to smuggle beavers out of the country to get the full market price.

This matter of state insurance is an excellent one. I understood the minister to say to-day that it only took in life insurance only. I do not think this will be found practicable, but if it included health insurance on the lines of the English bill, of which I happen to know something about, it would not only be a source of revenue but would decrease the national debt every year as well. A proper scheme would be to couple sickness and disability with this life plan, then the whole scheme would be a self-supporting and a source of revenue. I think the proper way would be to tackle that proposition right away. It seems to be wrong that we should start out on a very important matter as state insurance in such a petty way as this. The matter of state insurance should take second place to no problems for the consideration of the government. Indemnity for sickness and disability should be provided as well as in the case of death.

I hope when we get this bill that it will be as specific as possible with regard to the areas for the proposed killing of beavers. The Department of Marine and Fisheries should know first where beavers abound mostly in the country. I hope the minister will not content himself in allowing the Game Board or any member thereof to fix the price of skins below the market price. If he does it will defeat the whole object of the bill. It means, as I have already pointed out, that skins will be sent to St. John's at a figure below the market price, because it must be remembered that the department has got to make money out of the transaction. The Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is a great believer in the law of supply and demand and he should fix the price of beaver skins on that principle. As a matter of fact I hope that that feature of fixing a price would not

appear in the bill at all, although I suppose that is really the reason of section four being in the bill.

Referring to the proposed insurance scheme again, I would strongly advocate that our scheme be made a facsimile of the Lloyd George Act, the working of which I was identified with in Dublin, and I think it will be a paying proposition for us.

Then again, under this bill, there is going to be considerable difficulty in defining trapmen. Iconsider that any man who has been paying license for the past four or five years should receive a permit to kill beavers, but if you discriminate there will likely be endless trouble. And generally speaking you are going to be surrounded with many obstacles. You will want to appoint a large staff of wardens. A considerable number of sportsmen are coming into the country just now and occupying the attention of wardens at the present time.

However, I shall support any bill brought in from any part of this country to kill beavers.

The idea of taxing a few people for the sake of a state insurance is most unjust, and we should not be wasting time with it. We have been here five or six weeks and all we have done is to pass fishery laws. The best thing to do is to cut out this section of the bill altogether. I would suggest to the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries that in view of so many safeguards surrounding this bill this section be omitted. I don't see why a man should have to send his furs down here. Why should we penalize a man who shows a knowledge of trapping? Why should we tax him for the benefit of others? They should not be taxed a dollar. Next year we should bring in a bill for the standardization of beavers, and making provisions for a cull.

HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—I don't see the force of the statements of the hon. member for St. George's. Very few furs are sent out of the country direct by the people who catch them. They are bought up by agents who travel all over the country. The only difference now is that they will be sent out by the Marine and Fisheries Department, and the department will have a chance to make something on them.

MR. MacDONNELL:—There is a big difference. The man who catches the furs may not get near the price. There will be absolutely no competition, and the price paid will be the very lowest possible. Why should a man be made sell his furs to any one person?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I would like to make myself clear about this compulsory sale to the Marine and Fisheries Department. The people of Bay d'Espoir say that they don't want to sell for profit, but they want to be permitted to kill the beavers to get rid of the nuisance. I think the government should be allowed to say to those people that since this is a nuisance you may go and kill the beaver and send the furs to the Marine and Fisheries Department.

MR. MacDONNELL:—Mr. Chairman, I would like to know why a certain section of the people are so penalized. I want to say that the people whose interests I am here to look after are not of the same attitude as the people of Bay d'Espoir to whom the Hon. Minister of Justice refers.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—Mr. Chairman, I find that the hon. member for St. George's objects to this bill. Do you not think that the country has some right as well as the trappers? How soon will the price decline if agents are allowed to travel all over the country. If the furs are handled by the Marine and Fisheries Department the market will not be overstocked and a better

price will be obtained. The people of Alberta have to pay a dollar license to kill beaver on their own farms, and under no circumstances will they allow a private individual to buy a beaver skin.

MR. MacDONNELL:—Mr. Chairman, while there may be certain individuals in this house who would be affected by what they do in Canada it does not affect me. If you want to copy from Canada why not protect the salmon supply? This whole thing is most unfair. Why not put a tax on seals? Why legislate against a few individuals for the whole country?

I believe some money can be made out of it if the prices be so fixed as the hon. member for St. John's West has suggested and the people given an opportunity to take advantage of it.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Mr. Speaker, I might say that I am in favor of this bill (Respecting the Preservation of Beavers). I think the time has come when something ought to be done to give the people of this country an opportunity to reap the benefits and capture some of the wealth that has been secreted in the heart of the country for the past twenty-seven years. I think it is 27 years ago since this matter was first started. During this time I have spent at least sixteen years in the interior of the country on survey and I found that the beaver houses were increasing rapidly near the mouths of the various rivers. As to the government fixing the price I do not see any great difficulty in so doing. I do not see why the Game Board could not fix the price. The government of the country and the people would benefit there as far as I can see.

Now, as to having an open season, I know that every trapper trapping for the last six years knows every beaver house in a radius of fifty miles. There ought to be very stringent rules as to the killing of beaver. They should be allowed to shoot them but should not be allowed to cut open the house. Any one who has seen these houses knows that there is an outlet under water and an outlet over water. Now when the beavers are in the house all they have to do is to stop an outlet and then chop open the house and take out the whole family. I have seen at Bay of Islands on a river there a dam four hundred feet long built by the beavers. And on this account a field nearby was completely flooded. And something must be done to prevent the beaver from destroying such a quantity of birch and aspin as they harm.

I have seen a tree twelve inches in diameter severed by the beaver. Now there is certain trouble brewing if some trappers are refused them. Now I think they all get licenses but make them pay for them. Charge them a license fee of say fifty dollars. With regard to the remarks of Mr. Jennings as to poaching going on I may say this has been open secret for a long time. I do not agree with what he says. I know that beaver skins have been shipped out of the country year after year. I suggest that a license fee be charged. I also make the suggestion that only certain parts of the country be opened up at a time. I would not like to see beaver areas everywhere. I think there ought to be some reserved areas so that the beavers will keep on increasing. There should be something like the deer reservation at Howley where the beaver will keep on increasing. I will have more to say on this matter when we go into committee on this bill. I support the bill because I think it is a step in the right direction. I agree with Mr. Scammell when he says that an old man who worked with me for four years told him that the beavers die out after ten years. Some disease get amongst them and they perish. So I think it is worth while that the people shall be allowed to capture the animals and allow them

to be sold. It is to their interests that this be done.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—If a portion of my constituents knew that there was a discussion here on the beaver I did not take part in it they would be disappointed because there are several trappers in Baie de Espoir whom I met last fall while there canvassing who want to kill beaver. While Mr. Scammell and the honorable member for St. George's say that their districts contain the most beavers I think there are more beavers around Baie de Espoir than any other part of the country. They are becoming numerous and mischievous and I got a petition a short time ago signed by five hundred people asking that something be done to reduce their numbers. As far as the trappers of Baie de Espoir are concerned they want the beavers to be killed and I approached the government with the proposition that they should be allowed to kill beavers because they had become so numerous that they were a nuisance. If the government finds it right to allow them to kill the beavers and thereby extend to them the granting of their request I hope some steps will be taken to prevent their extermination. If it is found possible to deplete the beaver and thereby raise a fund to provide for state insurance while at the same time taking precaution to prevent their extermination I think it is a step in the right direction but I want to say that there will be a certain degree of beaver to be killed. I agree with Mr. Sullivan, the member for Placentia, which he suggests that the whole country should not be opened up at the same time. There is no doubt, I am firmly convinced, that Baie de Espoir will be benefitted greatly if the beaver is allowed to be marketed. But as soon as a man up there gets his license and I may say that many men there make a livelihood in trapping, I feel sure that every one of them will expect to get his and go and kill every beaver he can at Baie de Espoir. Yet I hope in those places where they will be allowed to be killed they will not be exterminated and that certain areas will be reserved so that we shall not lose the beaver altogether. I desire to say that so far as Baie de Espoir is concerned they desire that the beaver be killed. I do hope that when the Game Board is handling this question they will use their best endeavours to see that the beaver is not exterminated. With respect to the issuing of the licenses I may say that my constituents look upon the rights to trap as they look upon the right to live.

MR. MacDONNELL:—I hope that when the honorable member for Placentia, Mr. Sullivan, talked of the deer preserve at Howley he did not intend to also have a beaver preserve on the west coast. With this preserve one has to go five miles further beyond the track to shoot a deer than he would if there were no preserve at all. I may say that there are a tremendous lot of deer killed in this preserve for to feed the men of the A.N.D. Co. when the Minister of Justice claimed that certain sections should be preserved I hope my district shall not be inflicted with another one.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—Mr. Speaker, I would crave the indulgence of the house for a short time as I speak of a matter that is to me very important. I would like to ask the Hon. the Prime Minister if anything has yet been done to relieve the salt situation?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Messages have been received from the high commissioner in London, and also from Bowrings of Liverpool to the effect that a steamer has been procured to load salt for St. John's. A message has also been received to the effect that the Cadiz strike is still on.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—I have my-

self received word regarding the strike in Cadiz. I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he is aware or the government is aware that we are being charged $6.00 for salt per hogshead. I will tell the hon. minister now that I have been looking for 140 hogsheads. I couldn't get it at all in St. John's. They told me I could get it in Harbor Grace for $6.00. Are you going to regulate this thing or is it going on? Are you going to allow them to charge what they want to charge? Are you going to take any action or let it go. If you had any ability you would have done it long ago. Are you going to sit here indefinitely and do nothing? I told you about it ten days ago, and you did nothing until you were absolutely forced to.

There is another matter that I wish to speak of. Do you know how Newfoundland schooners are being treated in Sydney? Do you know that coal is now selling in the city at $20.80? Are you going to make any arrangement with the company? We have had vessels waiting in Sydney twenty-one days for coal. When are you going to do something?

I accept the apology of the Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, Mr. Chairman, for jumping into the debate and I make every allowance for him because I know that he hasn't the least idea of what he is talking about. He referred to the salt situation last year and the high prices that were charged for it. There was 120,000 hogsheads of salt in the city in the winter of 1918-1919 imported so that there would be no difficulty about this spring's supply and the government of which both Messrs. Halfyard and Coaker were members guaranteed importers of that salt that they would suffer no loss because of having to store it for the winter. I was accused of making money on salt at that time. It was said that I had ten thousand hogsheads of salt in my store but I knew nothing about it till I saw it in The Advocate. As a matter of fact I haven't imported a grain of salt these ten years, the only firms who import salt now being Messrs. Bowring Bros., Job Bros., Baine Johnston & Co. and Morey & Co. and these were give na guarantee at that time that if they imported the salt and stored it they would not lose on it. The hon. gentleman says that what I have said with regard to the seriousness of this situation is like an echo to him of what I said last year about the same time. It is no echo, it is fact. He also takes it as a joke, well all I can say to that is I wish it was a joke but unfortunately it is not. Now I haven't said that the government should do impossibilities, but I did say and I repeat that it should not have taken them ten days to get off a message and two days extra to send a second one in an effort to have something done. That is not the way we did things when the hon. gentlemen were in the government with me last year. We did not wait ten days nor one day when action was necessary and Mr. Halfyard himself often sat in my office while I wrote out messages that had to be sent. I did not question the ability of the gentlemen on the other side with this situation, because ability is not necessary to do the right thing in the case. What ability is needed to see these men who are now here on the matter of the Bell Island ore tax and make some arrangement where by our coal supply will be assured. I trust that the dark clouds to which the hon. minister referred will pass away but it is up to us to help them pass away, if he don't we must expect a rain storm. I am asking now that the Prime Minister and his executive do something to relieve the situation at Sydney with regard to our coal supply and I want the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to

give his attention to the matter of six dollars a hogshead being charged for salt. If a legitimate profit can be obtained by selling it at $4.00 or even at $3.70 surely it is nothing short of outrageous that fishermen should be charged six dollars.

I am absolutely in sympathy with the government and especially with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The position is a serious one and an unfortunate one, and like my hon. friend Mr. Halfyard, it is getting on my nerves. There is one point, however, which the hon. minister has failed to explain. He might have sat on the executive council for seven or eight hours yet it took him ten days to get a cable off after I had drawn his attention to the seriousness of the situation. Now we will forget salt for a time and take the matter of coal. The hon. minister need not go down and sit on the executive for ten hours to find out what to do about this, he can do all that is necessary in half an hour, and I'll go with him and show hom what to do if he doesn't know himself. He has also brought in the question of exchange in Oporto. We all know what is responsible for the fall in prices which we are getting for our fish today. It may be true as the hon. minister says, that the price in Oporto has not declined but nevertheless we are getting only 52 shillings for our fish, and the best anyone can hope to realize now is six dollars a quintal and some will not even get that. I do not blame the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for this condition of the Portuguese market and I have never accused him of being in any way responsible for it, but I do say that if his regulations had not been enforced, while losses might have been sustained, it would not have amounted to the general calamity that we have to-day. In conclusion I would say that if he is doing his best to deal with the salt situation I am satisfied, but now let us get at the coal situation and set that fixed up while the time is opportune.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Chairman, the question of coal might be an important one, but the main question before the house is one of such grave importance as to call for the serious consideration of every hon. member who represents in this assembly a constituency that is made up almost wholly of fishermen, and we owe a deep debt of gratitude to the last speaker, Sir John Crosbie, for bringing this matter so forcibly to the notice of the government. If it is true that six dollars is being charged for salt, and there is no reason whatever to doubt it, the thing is outrageous and I appeal to every hon. member representing as I do, a fishing district, and to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who I know has the interests of the great mass of our fishermen at heart, to probe this matter to the bottom and if it is found that such an exorbitant profit is being exacted from the fishermen, to do something at once to eliminate the gross injustice that is being done them. This is serious matter for the fishermen who already have to pay so dearly for the necessary supplies with which to carry on their avocation and while the things we cannot help must be endured, we should not let it be said that because of callous indifference to the welfare of the people, such a condition has been allowed to exist. Sir John Crosbie has placed this matter fairly before the government and I trust that at the close of this evening's sitting they will get busy and do something on behalf of the fishermen. If they cannot do what is necessary, I am prepared to act the local Jim Larkin and lead a body of fishermen to go down and break open the salt stores and hand the salt out to them. I sincerely hope that this serious state of affairs will not be permit-

ted to continue further than we can possibly help.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—I just want to say a word, Mr. Speaker, while we are on this subject. I can assure the hon. member that all the matters of which he has spoken have been receiving the serious consideration of the government not for the past te ndays, but for the past twenty, the past forty. For many days before hon. member for Port de Grave referred to the salt situation in this effort to find a solution of the difficulty that confronted us. Not only for hours at a time were we considering a way out, but for days and every means at our command was used. Messages were sent out to the imperial government and in other quarters in an attempt to overcome the difficulty. The matter of salt supply for this year was left in the hands of the importers as it was last year and we on our part agreed to protect them against loss, consequently we saw no reason to anticipate the trouble which subsequently arose and created the situation that we are now up against. I remember arriving here on Monday evening and Mr. Job at once sent word to me that the importers were powerless to do anything in the way of securing the season's supply of salt and asked me to meet him and discuss the matter. The Prime Minister and myself met him at 9 o'clock the same night and went fully into question of what was best to be done and the messages that have already been tabled were sent the next morning. Thru the agency of the British shipping board we were able to charter four steamers to proceed to Cadiz but they were still lying there awaiting their cargoes when the strike broke out. Here we were faced with another obstacle which none of us could have foreseen but we did not stop there. We immediately communicated with the Secretary of State and also got in touch with the British Ambassador at Madrid and also the Consul at Cadiz and asked them if it could possibly be arranged to have these steamers loaded, no matter what the cost, and we would pay the bill. If this arrangement could have been made we could have got the salt but of course at a very high cost as our instructions were to pay the strikers whatever their demands were. However, it would have been better to pay any price for it than to be without it. In the same way, the coal situation has been receiving serious consideration for months past and is receiving serious consideration to-day; anything that is possible to do will be done by the government. I believe that Sir John Crosbie knows very well the terrible responsibilities that were thrown upon the shoulders of the government on taking office, greater responsibilities perhaps than any previous government in this country had to contend with. We found the railway in a shocking condition and needing attention at once if it was to be kept going any longer, there was the Bell Island ore tax to be adjusted, the coal situation demanding constant consideration, the serious situation with regard to exchange in the European markets which threatened considerable loss to shippers and now the difficulty of our salt supply. The matter of exchange has been responsible for no small share of the troubles we have been up against. The price of fish has not declined in Portugal as has been continually stated it is exactly the same now as it was in February but the constantly increasing value of Portubuese money is responsible for the low prices we are getting.

Sterling exchange has gone from one shilling one six pence to eleven pence which accounts for why we are realizing only 52 shillings for our fish altho the Portuguese people are paying just as much as they paid when we re-

ceived 81 shillings. This problem of exchange has also been receiving the closest attention of the government and last night we met the managers of the four city banks to see if we could arrive at some conclusion as to what steps, if any, could be taken to deal with it. In no way have we neglected to do what seemed to us best under the circumstances and no effort has been spared by either myself or my colleagues in endeavoring to get out of the difficulties, many of which are the direct result of the neglect of our predecessors in office. However, if the hon. member for Port de Grave can show us some more effective way to deal with these questions it would be more to the point for him to make his suggestions than to keep on trying to make things look worse than they really are. In my opinion we ought to have the War Measures Act enacted for another year to meet such conditions as he has referred to. He states that six dollars a hogshead is being asked for salt but arrangements were made between the government and the importers on the same basis as last year and the latter cannot charge more than four dollars. If he will give me the facts of the case he has referred to, I will see that if anyone has been charged more than four dollars they will have the amount paid over and above that refunded them.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:— Mr. Speaker, in moving that the House adjourn until Monday next at three o'clock in the afternoon, I desire to call the attention of the house, but particularly of Sir John Crosbie to a grossly inaccurate report in The Evening Herald of certain references which were made regarding the salt situation on yesterday. Tt the top of the second editorial column of The Herald of today's date there is the following: "What was the nature of this message was not revealed, but it was stated by the speaker" (Sir John Crosbie) "that it was of such a character that in the interests of the courtesy so that he might have the terms made public." The house knows that Sir John Crosbie knows particularly, that that statement is absolutely incorrect. Sir John asked informally for certain information in connection with the salt situation. No notice of question was given; it was purely an informal request. In replying I gave him personally certain telegraph messages which had passed with the High Commissioner in England and Bowring Brothers at Liverpool, and as a matter of courtesy so that he might have the full information I handed him a copy of the despatch sent by His Excellency the Governor to the Secretary of State for the Colonies requesting certain action by the proper officials of the Imperial Government. Sir John Crosbie, who is well acquainted with the procedure in such matters knew that the message was handed him for his personal information and for the personal information of the members of the opposition and the message was shown by Sir John to Sir Michael Cashin, the leader of the opposition. Sir John knows from his considerable parliamentary experience that it is not the practice of this house that such communications should be tabled particularly not during the period of negotiations. What Sir John really said, as the house will remember, was that this document was of a confidential nature and that for the present at least it would not be made public. There was absolutely nothing in the message which could possibly justify any other observation from Sir John and no other observations were made. I am sure my honorable friend will agree with me that that is so. The statements which are made in The Herald are absolutely false and are an instance which the opposition press is attempting to take advantage of the

personal courtesy which I extended to a member of the opposition. The opposition will understand the fact that if their press does not know how to appreciate a courtesy but would make such a contemptible use of it as is done by the opposition in their paper this afternoon, then courtesies cannot be extended.

In the fourth column of the same paper there is another reference: "The other was addressed to the Secretary of State for the Colonies the contents of which were too serious to reveal to the country at present." The message, as Sir John Crosbie and Sir Michael Cashin, the leader of the opposition, both know was an ordinary business message asking that attention be given by the Imperial authorities to certain matters in connection with the salt situation. There is absolutely nothing whatever in the message which could for one moment suggest such an observation as that made in this newspaper. These statements are made purely for party political purposes and the reason why Sir John Crosbie and other members of the opposition are not taken more seriously by this house and by the country in the criticisms which they offer in connection with public matters is because everyone realizes that their criticisms are not in the interests of the country, the salt condition and the fish trade, but that any criticisms that are offered are of a purely partisan character, and these editorial references are in themselves conclusive proof of the contemptible attempting to turn a practical business despatch asking the assistance of the Imperial authorities in connection with a serious salt situation affecting Newfoundland into political capital.

SIR JOHN CROSBIE:—What the Prime Minister says about the words that I used yesterday with respect to the despatch from the Governor to the Secretary of State is correct. There was nothing in that despatch which might not be published. When the Prime Minister handed me the despatch he called my attention to the fact that it was a confidential document and that it was for the information of the opposition and not for tabling in the ordinary course. I consequently did not read the message to the house but merely referred to the contents of the message and the date upon which it was sent. The salt situation is a serious one. My criticism was not that it was a message which ought not to have been sent, but that it ought to have been sent ten days before.

Mr. Fox gave notice of question.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, May 31st, 1920.

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

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Speaker, at your request and on your behalf, I ask leave to present a petition from the electorate of Perry's Come in the District of Carbonear, asking that the government disallow any modification of the Prohibition Act.

MR. ABBOTT:—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the people of Birchy Cove, Newman's, Lower and Upper Amherst Coves, in the District of Bonavista, asking that hte road from Bonavista to Upper Amherst Cove be put in good condition and that a motor truck be placed on the route between these places. The request of the petitioners is a reasonable one as their requirements in this respect are necessary for the conveyance of reight and passengers. The places named in the petition have a total population of over a thousand

people and in spite of their fishing and business activities they are practically cut off from all the business centres such as Bonavista, Catalina and King's Cove. The bay steamers have never made any of these places a port of call and having no railway connection it is impossible for them to get their produce to Bonavista. The petition is signed by some of the influential people of Bonavista, including Rev. Father Dwyer, Mr. John S. Rowsell, Mr. H. G. Mifflen, Mr. N. Ryan, H. J. Sawyers and others. I give it my hearty support and ask that it be referred to the Department of Public Works and I feel sure that the government will grant the request of the petitioners.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Mr. Fox, the bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 162 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (third series) entitled 'Of the Prosecution of the Seal Fishery,'" was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of the Hon. the Prime Minister the amendments made by the Legislative Council in and upon the bill sent up entitled "An Act to provide for the Better Obtaining of Information respjecting the Codfishery" were read a second time and concurred in, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the said amendments has been agreed to without amendment.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. the Prime Minister, the amendments made by the Legislative Council in and upon the bill sent up and entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 176 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Encouragement of Shipbuilding,'" were read a second time and concurred in and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the said amendments had been agreed to without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the bill sent up entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 172 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Survey of Foreign-going and Labrador Vessels,'" with some amendments in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the said amendments were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the bill entitled "An Act to amend 'The Business Profits Tax Act, 1917,'" 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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the bill entitled "An Act to amend Cap. X of 1919 George V, entitled 'An Act with respect to Existing Tenancies and Ejectment therefrom'" 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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice, the bill entitled "An Act to authorize the Montreal Trust Company to do business in the Colony of Newfoundland" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed being being entitled as above and that it be

sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that House.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole conconsider the bill entitled "An Act respecting Licenses to Cut Hardwood."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of committee.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Before passing this bill I would like to ask whether it is the intention of the government to permit witch hazel or other timber to be cut within the three mile limit. It is common knowledge that there is at present a great scarcity of hardwood and as witch hazel and birch are perhaps the only timbers to be had for building vessels I think the three mile limit should be protected for the benefit of the fishermen, and ask that a clause be inserted providing this protection.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Chairman, I propose to ask the house to pass the first and second sections of the bill, and then to move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again on to-morrow. The point which the leader of the opposition has raised is one which has already been considered by the government, and on to-morrow an amendment will be submitted to provide that no licenses to cut hardwood shall be issued if a representative number of the electors of the section of the country which might be affected by such hardwood timber cutting protest against that being done. I would point out that under the bill as it is at present the discretion is vested in the Governor in Council, and that the Governor in Council would not give a license for the cutting in the three mile limit. Where such cutting would be injurious to the public welfare but to make that position perfectly clear in the bill itself an amendment will be introduced under which notice would be given to the people who might be affected by the erection of a veneer mill in their vicinity and the cutting of birch and witch hazel, so that if a representative section of the people who would be affected thereby enter a protest, the license will not issue. There are sections of the country in which there are people who would welcome the erection of a veneer mill and in which the cutting of birch and witch hazel would not be injurious to the shipbuilding interests of the locality. It is quite probable that there are other sections in which the people might object to the erection of a veneer mill and the cutting of timber. This discretion will consequently be generally vested in the Governor in Council, as is now provided for in this bill, with the limitation that a protest by a reasonably large proportion of residents shall prevent the issue of a license. I feel that this amendment fully meets the suggestion of the hon. member.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—I don't think that this should be left to the Governor in Council. If you leave it to the Governor in Council any outsider may come in at any time and a point may be strained to meet their demands. I think the right place to settle that is right here.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I fear I did not make the scope of the amendment to which I referred sufficiently clear. The hon. member will remember that some days ago I moved that the second reading of this bill be deferred, and I did so because on a perusal of the bill I felt that there might be some question as to the desirability of vesting in the Governor in Council an absolutely discretion in connection with the issue of licenses affecting the three mile limit. I appreciate the great importance of the

shipbuilding industry and the fact that the timber which would be used for veneer would to a very large extent be timber which would be used for shipbuilding. Important as it is to assist in every possible manner the development of a new enterprise, particularly one in which large capital would be vested and considerable employment given, an industry which will not be for goods of local consumption only, but will be adding largely to the value of our export trade, yet the government's special desire is to see that the interests of the fishermen and in the interests of shipbuilding be fully protected. The amendment which it is the intention to introduce fully covers that point, as it provides that no license shall be issued affecting any portion of the three-mile limit when the fishermen and shipbuilders interested in that particular area as the source of supply for the shipbuilding material files a protest against the issue of a license.

Notice of the application for a licensee to cut hardwood on that particular area will be given to the people resident in and interested in that area for shipbuilding purposes, and they will ben given sufficient time withi which to register a protest before any license shall issue. Thus there would be an option in the Governor in Council to refuse in all cases, but in so far as the application relates to the three-mile limit, the option of the Governor in Council to grant would be conditional on no sufficient protest having been lodged within a certain period of time after the people interested in the area had been notified of the application.

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.

The House resolved itself into a committee on the whole on the bill entitled "An Act for the Preservation of Beavers."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

MR. MacDONNELL:—With regard to this section of the bill, which gives to the Governor in Council power to fix limits to to the killing of beavers in any section of this country, and fixing other places where they may not be killed, I think that we are giving the Governor in Council too much power in this respect. If we are to have an open season, it is unfair that any section should be penalized. If we are to allow beaver to be killed in some parts of the country we should allow it in all parts. I would like the Minister to explain this matter.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—Mr. Chairman, in accordance with the request of Mr. MacDonnell, I would say, that the explanation of this lies in the fact that in some sections of this country beaver are very scarce, and in others they are very plentiful, and unless we fix the rules to meet these regulations the beaver will be exterminated, and this is the object of the bill. In certain sections of the counttry beaver are just beginning to appear. They are just beginning to appear in the bottom of Bonavista Bay, and we want to preserve them in those sections. The Game Board, who through their wardens will be conversant with those matters, will be in a position to limit certain sections. All regulations will be first submitted to the Game Board, for approval. There has never been any complaint of the actions of the Game Board. They have been very faithful in their duties, and I think we can safely leave it in their hands to handle this matter.

MR. MacDONNELL:—Is it the same board that was responsible for the deer reservation?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—It is the same board.

MR. MacDONNELL:—In that case I can assure you that I know two thousand men who are not at all satisfied with the actions of the board in that matter, and if the Game Board made a mistake in the deer reservation they might do the same again with regard to regulations for the killing of the beaver, but if the Hon. Minister thinks that it is necessary for certain areas to be preserved, then I am satisfied. I presume it is the intention to issue licenses to bona fide trappers, and I think that something should be put in the bill now to let us know to whom these licenses will be issued. I don't think that there can be any objections to that.

MR. BENNETT:—While this matter was before the House for its second reading I think that I pointed out that there would be a great deal of difficulty in the issuing of licenses for the killing of beaver. I suggest that this matter should be controlled entirely by the Game Board, and that they would carry out the killing themselves. They would select suitable men to do the killing, and unless this is done, all the beaver will be exterminated, and I submit this matter to the Minister for his consideration.

MR. SCAMMELL:—In regard to the matter of paying for licenses, I find myself in accordance with the views of the Hon. Mr. Jennings, namely, that the man who wants to kill the beavers can least afford to pay for a license; at the same time there is going to be great difficulty in limiting the licenses to fact it is difficult to decide what conbona fide trappers. As a matter of stitutes a bona fide trapper. In certain areas in my district where beavers are plentiful the men who would go after beavers would be engaged at the fisheries for the greater part of the year. In fact he would only go trapping beavers in the autumn season.

MR. MacDONNELL:—This bill was bad enough before, but if the suggestion offered by the Honorable Member for St. John's West be adopted, it will be worse. I think with all due deference to the Member for St. John's West that the Game Board has no business to control this matter at all. Any beavers that are to be killed should be killed by the bona fide trappers of the country, and you can prevent extermination of the beavers by having a close season. If you allow one man in any section to kill beavers, and forbid the rest, you will find that before he gets to work that all the beavers will be killed. If you discriminate in his matter and only allow certain people n certain sections to kill beaver, this act will never be carried out.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Chairman, I think that the answer to this question is to create zones, or districts where you can kill beaver, and you cannot discriminate with regard to the granting of licenses. Take my own district for instance. They are all trappers down there, and I am sure that they know of every beaver house within fifteen or twenty miles, and as soon as a license is granted all the beavers will be killed. I don't think the Game Board should employ people to kill beavers. I want the trappers in my district to be given licenses but we don't want the beavers exterminated and the only safeguard we have and I am not sure that that is one, is the creation of these districts. In Bay D'Espair, they want to get rid of the beavers, because they are a nuisance but in the other parts they are not considered so, and the only thing to do, is to preserve them in some sections, and to kill them in others.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the remarks of the Minister of Justice that it is not pos-

sible to discriminate as to who you should give a license to. Any man, whether he is a bona fide trapper or not, should be entitled to a license, because after all this is going to be easy money; but the best way I think to get over the difficulty is to charge a substantial fee say $50 for a license. If you are going to select one, two or three bona fide trappers in every settlement, you are going to have endless trouble. Therefore, I think it would be better to issue those licenses, subject to a substantial fee. Or you could make the fee $25 for that matter.

HON. MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS —Mr. Chairman, in whatever way I view the matter I see difficulties in the way. If you are going to charge a license fee of $50 you will cut out the man who wants to kill beavers the most and who are worse in need of money. With the statement made that beavers can be easily exterminated, I do not know what to think. For a number of years, before they were prohibited from being hunted beavers were killed throughout the country, but they were not all exterminated, there was quite enough left for breeding purposes. A close season can be put on them at any time. That would be the business of the Game Board to find out if beavers were in danger of being exterminated. If they were a close season could be put into effect right away. I believe that the principle of indiscriminate killing will make the bill an unpopular one.

MR. MacDONNELL:—I think that licenses should be granted to bona fide trappers free of charge.

MR. SINNOTT:—I beg to agree with that idea.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—I may say in reply to the honorable member for St. George's that under this section (bill for the preservation of beavers) that licenses shall be issued in accordance with the regulations published and they should be bona fide trappers free of charge.

MR. FOX:—I see a danger in this section and think that the beaver will be exterminated. It is all right to be nice and generous like the honorable the member for St. George's but I do not like to see the extermination of the beaver in particular sections of the country as will be under this section. As usual in this country we close the door after the horse is stolen. We ought to handle this matter with circumspection. We ought not to have any principle of discrimination because under it it is impossible to have satisfactory results. I also think that there ought to be a limit to the number of beavers kill in any particular section.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—That will be done. The number of beavers will be limited under the regulations.

MR. FOX:—Why not bona fide trappers only?

HON. MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS —I do not see any difference if this license is granted to one dozen men or fifty. I would not vote for any bill which contains discrimination.

MR. MacDONNELL:—I spoke the other day when notice of this bill (beaver bill) was given against this idea of making money off the trappers. Why not tax the man who catches a fox or the man who brings in seals. I think this is too foolish for anything. You seem to say to the trappers that "because the beavers are numerous you are allowed too kill them off and we are going to tax because of helping to get rid of a nuisance. As the result of your industry and your labour in killing off the beaver without permission we are going to make one hundred thousand dollars." The trappers have got to sel ltheir skins to the Department of Marine and Fisheries who will corner all the skins and then mar-

ket theb abroad in the best markets and obtain the best figures and the result is that the department will net the sum of one hundred thousand dollars. The price to be given for the skins to the trappers will be reckoned according to the number of skins got and the price obtained for them. That is manifestly unjust. I think it is impossible to carry out this bill. I knew men who trap and if they are lucky enough to get beavers they will not if they think they can get a better deal elsewhere, send down their skins to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to make for the state insurance fund one hundred thousand dollars. Suppose there is a slump in the price of beaver what a nice position the trappers may find themselves in. They might not realize on their skins enough to pay for the freight. I think we are having too many regulations here. The minister took upon himself the responsibility of bringing in the fishery regulations and if there is any blame coming he will have to shoulder it or if any credit he will have the benefit of it. The whole future of the fishery structure depends upon the minister because of these regulations and now he comes into the house and introduces another bill under which more regulations will be made and he will decide who will catch and kill beavers and out of the affair the department will realise one hundred thousand dollars. Now I do not think this fair and decent. Now it is a pity that the important matter of state insurance should be started in such a petty manner. Now I think it is ridiculous to have say fishermen benefit from the trapping of beavers an adventure in which they took no part. Certainly trappers are not going to feel inclined to start state insurance for others. If we want to start state insurance we ought not do so by taxing the trappers on the skins they procure. If we are going to penalize them in the sum of one hundred thousand dollars one ought to foresee the dissatisfaction that is surely coming. This sum will be quite a little nest egg for the state insurance fund. If we are in earnest about this matter we ought to bring in a bill covering it and which shall also include sickness and disability. In England under such a scheme the weekly contribution is five pence. Of that sum two pence is given by the employer and three pence by the employee. Each quarter a card is sent to the government showing the number of weekly contributions paid by each contributor on the basis of five pence per week per man but paid in proportion by the workman and employer. This amount is deducted and put on the card. These cards are sent to the government to take a record of them. In the case of sickness a man is allowed ten shillings per week for a period of twenty six weeks and after that it is reduced to seven and six pence and that in a country like Ireland which has a rural population which is unusually healthy, even taking the city with the country it is found to be a very satisfactory proposition. I know because I was in those sections where the matter has prominence and know of the cheques being sent to a sinking fund for the reduction of the national debt.

HIS HONOR THE SPEAKER:— Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether Carbonear produces any beavers or whether the beavers have given any trouble there or that they will prove a source of revenue to the country. If there have not been too many bouquets thrown at him already I would like to hand another bouquet to the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries for his efforts in dealing with our natural resources. Looking at this bill in the light as it appears to me, I imagine Sir, that you are endeavoring to take advantage of one of our natural resources in order to turn it to a very

good use that will be a benefit to succeeding generations, if your ideas can be carried into effect, and in the carrying out of this new idea I think that the matter should be left safely in the hands of the Game Board. I do not see how you can issue licenses to trappers for the different districts, without making an awful lot of trouble. By reason of the fact that you do not want to exterminate beavers, you cannot issue licenses to every trapper, therefore, to my mind, the right thing to do would be to leave the matter in the hands of the Game Board and allow them to take different districts upon different seasons and kill so many beavers in each particular district so as to safeguard the extermination. I think that that arrangement could be easily carried out with the assistance of wardens, who would be employed by the Game Board. I believe this should be undertaken as a government measure to allow the revenue to be taken charge of by the government to be appropriated to the state insurance fund. I think that would be the better way of dealing wit hthe matter. I read an article not very long ago dealing with one of the national parks in Canada and which is situated in the northern part of the province of Quebec. The article stated that in certain seasons they allowed certain keepers to kill off deer and fur-bearing animals. One of the engineers employed there estimated that they could get enough deer meat to supply the whole population of Canada. In addition the amount of revenue derived from the skins of foxes and other fur-bearing animals in the park would provide enough funds to discharge the interest on the whole national debt of Canada. If that can be done in Canada, I would commend to you sir, the forming of a national park in Newfoundland. I think that the idea of getting to work here on a big national park would be a good one.

MR. SCAMMELL:—Mr. Chairman, in regard to the matter of paying for licenses I find myself in accordance with the views of the hon. Mr. Jennings, namely, that the man who wants to kill beavers can least afford to pay for a license; at the same time there is going to be great difficulty in limiting the licenses to bona fide trappers. As a matter of fact it is difficult to decide what constitutes a bona fide trapper. In certain areas in my district where beavers are plentiful the men who would go after beavers would be engaged at the fisheries for the greater part of the year. In fact he would only go trapping in the autumn season.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with the proposition that a license fee should be charged. It does not make a bit of diffence whether ten men go out to kill beavers or whether twenty men do it. The principle is the same and it only means that with a less number of men it will take a few days more to do the work. If you charge a fee of $25 or $50 it will be like the sealfishery and codfishery. Somebody will supply the money and then beavers will be killed indiscriminately.

MR. MACDONNELL:—Mr. Chairman, while there may be certain individuals in this house who would be affected by what they do in Canada it does not affect me. If you want to copy from Canada why not protect the salmon supply? This whole thing is most unfair. Why not put a tax on seals? Why legislate against a few individuals for the whole country?

Why not tax the salmon fishers and the lobster catchers in the same way, since the country has also provided close seasons for both these fisheries in the same way that it has protected the beaver. This is simply discrimination against a certain class of persons. If the hon. minister is honest about this thing, why not make it clear that

the price to be paid by the department for the furs will be put up to the full market price. Right back of that section is the intention to make money off the few people in this country who do any trapping and that can be called nothing but rotten legislation. If you want to institute state insurance, tax the public as a whole and I will give it my hearty support but I object to any department or board, whether it be a life board or a hereditary board, it matters not, having the sole right to purchase these furs, and I shall vote against that section.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The chairman from the committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the bill with some amendment.

On motion this report was received.

On motion for adoption of this report, Mr. MacDonnell moved that section 4 of the bill be deleted.

Whereupon the house divided and there appeared for the amendment: Sir M. P. Cashin, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Fox, Mr. Vinnicombe, Mr. Moore, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Sinnott, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. MacDonnell (9).

And against it: Hon. the Prime Minister, Minister of Justice, Minister of Finance and Customs, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Minister of Education, Mr. Foote, the Minister of Public Works, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Small, Mr. Hibbs, Mr. Scammell, Mr. Targett, Mr. Guppy, Mr. Jones, Mr. Samson, Mr. Bennett, Minister of Posts and Telegraphs (18).

On a division being taken the motion was lost by a vote of 18-8.

So it passed in the negative.

The original motion for adoption of the report was then put when these appeared in its favor: Hon. the Prime Minister, Minister of Justice, Minister of Finance and Customs, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Minister of Education, Mr. Foote, Minister of Public Works, Mr. Abbott, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Small, Mr. Hibbs, Mr. Scammell, Mr. Targett, Mr. Guppy, Mr. Jones, Mr. Samson, Mr. Bennett, Minister of Posts and and Telegraphs (18).

And against it: Sir M. P. Cashin, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Fox, Mr. Vinnicombe, Mr. Moore, Mr. Walsh, Mr. Sinnott, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. MacDonnell (9).

So it is passed in the affirmative and was ordered accordingly.

It was ordered that the said bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs the house resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider the bill entitled "An Act respecting the Postal and Telegraph Services."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of committee.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—I would like, Mr. Chairman to ask the hon. minister in charge of this bill what amount his department has received from the Commercial Cable Co. and if any amount was paid in accordance with the judgment of the courts and what is being done about Port aux Basques. Also, I would like him to inform us what amount is paid by the several newspapers in the city for the foreign news service and what the cost of this is to the colony. I would ask the committee to rise until this information is forthcoming.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS:—Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the desire of the hon. leader of the opposition to have this information and I do not think there is any desire on our part not to give him the fullest replies to his questions but I should like for him to have his questions put on the order paper in the usual way in which case I think I may promise him a reply at our next sitting, but no purpose can be served by the committee's rising now as the infor-

mation asked for has nothing whatever to do with the passing or otherwise of this bill.

The committee rose and reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the bill without amendment.

Second reading of bill entitled "An Act Concerning Former Enemy Aliens.'

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this bill I desire to say that it is the result, I think, of a bill of the self-governing colonies of the British Empire, and I am introducing it in response to despatches from the other side. It is the same as the English act and provides that during the next three years no person who was an enemy alien during the war shall be permitted to land in Newfoundland without permission or having landed here, shall only be permitted to remain by permission from the Colonial Secretary, to be granted only on special grounds and for a limited period. As a matter of fact the principle is the same as that of the act in force during the war and it is to continue it for another three years that this bill is being introduced.

The bill was thereupon read a second time and ordered to be submitted to a committee of the whole house on to-morrow.

Hon. Minister of Justice gave notice of motion.

Mr. Bennett gave notice of question.

Mr. Walsh gave notice of question.

Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries gave notice of motion.

The house then adjourned till to-morrow at 3 o'clock.

TUESDAY, June 1st, 1920.

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

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Chairman, I beg leave to present petition from the people of Petit Forte, Placentia Bay, signed by all the planters in that place and asking that a sum of money be granted for the completion of the public wharf there. This wharf I might say was commenced in 1914 but owing to the outbreak of war it was not found possible to provide sufficient funds to complete it. Last year when my colleagues and myself took over the control of the funds of that district we allocated a sum of money for that purpose but it was quite inadequate to finish the work. This is a very important settlement and harbour and a new firm has now opened business there. It is used by not only the fishermen of Petit Forte but by many others of Placentia Bay who go there owing to its suitability for fishing purposes. It is hoped that in the near future this settlement will be one of the largest in the bay and I have no doubt that when the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is making up his estimates provision will be made for this imperative necessity. I have very much pleasure in giving the petition my heartiest support.

MR. SULIVAN:—Mr. Speaker, I fully endorse what has been said by my colleague Mr. Walsh in presenting this petition and in view of the fact that there is only one wharf on this side of Placentia Bay I don't think it would be asking too much to have this done. The sum of money asked for is $1500 and the completion of this work will be a great boon not only to the people of Petit Forte but to the whole people of the western shore of Placentia Bay.

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

MR. MacDONNELL:—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a number of petitions from the district of St. George's, containing the signatures of nine hundred of the inhabitants on the subject of an amendment to the prohi-

bition act. These petitions have signatures from every part of Bay St. George and Bay of Islands and they include names of clergymen of all denominations, as well as the names of other prominent people, in those places, and I would like to suggest that whatever department of the government these petitions are referred to that some account of the number of signatures will be taken so that later on we may be able to get information if we want to. I don't think it right, that a movement of this character should be ignored by the government or should be put into any pigeon-hole or waste paper basket. All these signatures are guaranteed to be bona fide and as I said before I would like to suggest that some account be taken, both of those in favor of moderation and against modification of the act, so that we will be able to know the feeling of the country in this matter. I wish to say that I give my unqualified support to the prayer of these petitions.

Mr. Walsh asked the Hon. the Prime Minister (a) if it is the intention of the government to create a department of labor. (b) When said department will be established. (c) Will legislation in connection with said establishment be introduced at the present session of the legislature.

Answer to question asked by Mr. Walsh.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:— Within the course of a few days there will be submitted to the legislature a bill relating to trade disputes. This bill includes provisions for the appointment of a council or board to handle matters in dispute between employers and employees. My honourable friend will remember that reference was made in my manifesto issued last October to the creation of a council or board and this bill which has already been drafted by the solicitor of the House will be laid upon the table for consideration very shortly. It is the first step in the carrying out of that program. This Bill does not go so far as to create a new department.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider certain resolutions respecting the improvement of roads.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of committee.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:— Mr. Chairman, in moving these resolutions I wish it to be understood that I am not acting on behalf of the government. They have been handed me to be piloted through the House by those outside of the House who are interested in this matter. I realize that in these resolutions there will be some things that will not commend themselves to the House and I wish to assure you that so far as I am concerned I am prepared to amend them in any way, that will not destroy their value. In discussing these I would like members to understand that as far as the motor association is concerned, although they have asked that a commission be nominated by them, they do not insist on this, but they think that as they have a large interest in the roads and the money which goes towards improving them, will largely be theirs, that in this way they will have a better chance of seeing that the money is properly spent, and that the work is faithfully carried out, than by leaving it in the hands of anybody who might be interested in the matter, merely from political motives. Now generally speaking I don't think that there is anything that can be held against the principle of these resolutions. If this is a whole hearted effort to improve the roads let us get right into it. I am quite sure, that the amount of money that has been spent in Hr. Main, Brig-

us and Hr. Grace for this purpose since the introduction of motor cars into the country would be found to be considerable and the same thing applies to the Southern Shore. I know myself that motor cars have created a market from Topsail, Manuels and Kelligrews for things which did not exist before, they came here and I am sure the amount of money derived from this is considerable. It costs something to run a car these days and one must remember that every time a car goes to a garage to be repaired it means a bill of no small proportion. If the roads are put in such a condition accidents will be made less frequent. It will mean that a car can be run more cheaply, and that more people will buy them, and the more cars that are bought the more revenue the government gets, and the more money spent in labour and chauffeurs and in the various other ways.

Therefore in submitting these resolutions to the committee, I would ask them to remember that they are not for the benefit of the motorists only. The man who saves an axle, altho his waggon may not be a very expensive one will get just as much benefit from them as those who run more expensive machines. Therefore I ask the committee to give these resolutions a fair show, and endeavour to see if we cannot improve the present conditions of the roads thru these resolutions.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Chairman, with regard to the resolutions that are before the House I agree that their object is one that deserves a full measure of support but might I suggest to the Hon. Attorney General, particularly in light of his own statement that he brought the bill in in response to a request from people outside the House, that it would be time well spent if we got twenty-four hours to consider the matter. He will appreciate the fact, that we will not want to come in here and support them, without having a chance for consideration. I would like to see some sort of a conference in which those of us, the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance, who are directly concerned with what might be looked upon as opposition from the city council, could take part. I think this would be time well spent and I beg to suggest it to the Hon. the Minister of Justice.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The chairman from the committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the bill entitled "An Act to amend the Pilotage Act, 1917," was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Mr. Bennett asked the Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs if Miss Edith Brown, postmistress at Tilton, C.B., sister of ex-Private David Brown, M.M., had been notified of her dismissal from the public service and if so state cause of such dismissal.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. the Prime Minister the amendments made by the Legislative Council in and upon the bill sent up entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 172 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (third series) entitled 'Of the Survey of Foreign-going and Labrador Vessels'" were read a second time and concurred in, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council, acquainting that body that the said amendments had been agreed to without amendment.

Pursuant to order and on motion of

Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the bill entitled "An Act respecting the Preservation of Beavers" 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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs the bill entitled "An Act respecting the Postal and Telegraph Services" 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 provosions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider the bill entitled "An Act respecting Licenses to Cut Hard Woods."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:— On yesterday after the first and second sections had been passed I asked the committee to rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again to-day, so that an opportunity may be given to fully consider amendments which I asked the solicitor of the House to draft in relation to the issue of licenses on the three-mile limit. I now submit the amendments as additional sub-sections 3 and 4 to section 2 of the bill. This addition is to provide that three months public notice of any application for licenses under this bill must be given in The Royal Gazette and one other newspaper before the application will be considered by the council. The Department of Agriculture and Mines will take care to see that information of the application is conveyed to the towns and settlements within the area covered by the application. The residents of that area who are in the habit of cutting birch and witch hazel from the area for shipbuilding purposes will have an opportunity of filing a petition at the Department of Agriculture and Mines and no licenses can under this bill be granted by the Governor in Council in any case in which forty per cent. of the electors resident within the area protest against the issue of a license. The people interested in any particular area will consequently have the opportunity of deciding for themselves as to whether a veneer mill should or should not be established in their locality. If the circumstances are such that forty per cent. of the electors decide that the birch and witch hazel within that area shall be reserved for shipbuilding purposes, no licenses will issue. If, however, the circumstances are such that the people of the neighborhood welcome the large operations and considerable labor which a veneer mill would give and feel that shipbuilding interests are fully protected, they will file no protest. I feel that all possible objection to the granting of licenses for the cutting of birch and witch hazel on the three mile limit are overcome by this provision which has the effect of placing the decision in the hands of the people who are interested in the area in question.

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 to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider the bill entitled "An Act respecting Former Enemy Aliens."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs 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 bill without amendment.

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

The Minister of Public Works gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled "An Act concerning Local Affairs in Outport Districts."

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

The House adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, June 2nd, 1920.

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

Second reading of Council's amendment respecting the Registry of Midwives.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, the amendment in this bill is the addition of another section, which makes it quite clear as to whether or not the Governor in Council may determine the act and which reads as follows: "The Governor in Council may apply the said rules and regulations from time to time and from such part or parts of the colony as they may deem fit."

Second reading of Council's amendment to "Act respecting Legislative Disabilities and the Vacation of Seats in the House of Assembly."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, it will be remembered that section (3) in this bill had an important bearing on the election of Mr. Cave. The section has been stricken out, as it is entirely unnecessary now. I consequently move that the amendment be read a second time.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Public Works I ask leave to introduce a bill to amend the Local Affairs Act.

Third reading of bill "An Act respecting Former Enemy Aliens."

Second reading of bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 162 of the Consolidated Statutes, Third Series, entitled 'Of the Prosecution of the Seal Fishery."

MR. FOX:—Mr. Speaker, as this bill is still in the hands of the printers I would ask that it be deferred.

Committee of the whole on resolution respecting the improvement of roads.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Chairman, since the committee sat yesterday we had a conference with those members of the House who represent the districts named in the bill or as far as we could get them. Some alterations were made and section (1) of the bill now will read in effect that the commission shall constitute not more than ten persons, three to be nominated by the Governor in Council, three by the Motor Association and the Government themselves to appoint the Deputy Minister of Public Works with the addition of the Chairman of Public Works, who shall be chairman ex-officio.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS:—Mr. Chairman, I notice that Trinity district is conspicuous by its absence in this bill. I think I expressed myself already on this bill when speaking to the petition and I cannot say that I am in favor of it. That part of the bill which asks for government support I do not endorse, but outside of that it strikes me that Trinity district should be included in the bill, because motor cars are continually going to Heart's Content and

Carbonear, but they do not go beyond these places. Now there is a very good road from Heart's Content to New Perlican and it would be a grand thing if that road was improved right down to Lead Cove; in fact I see no reason why the South Side of the Bay should not be included in the bill.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—All right; the south side will be included.

MR. CHEESEMAN:—Mr. Chairman, it might be news to some people perhaps to know that the district of Burin has got motor cars and, now that there are going to be special givings out in the way of motor roads Burin is going to ask for its share. I cannot say that I am in perfect agreement with the object of this bill. If all the districts were compensated in the way of special grants it would be a good idea, but to give grants to districts that have the advantage of a railway and with roads much better than we have in the district of Burin, I cannot see that I would be doing justice to my constituents to support the bill and give money out of the general revenue of the country to the particular sections named in the bill. And, as I said before, we actually have motor cars in Burin now.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—In reply to the hon. member for Burin, Mr. Cheeseman, I may say that while perhaps his district does not enjoy the benefit of road grants we do here in St. John's and other places, something over a quarter of a million dollars was spent in the district of Burin. I think that will go along way in upsetting the argument of the hon. member.

MR. CHEESEMAN:—That quarter of a million dollars was spent on marine works and it will take a quarter of a million more to have anything like sufficient improvement.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Perhaps the hon. member for Burin, Mr. Cheeseman, was not present when I introduced these resolutions. The principle of these resolutions is that in the various districts where there are motor cars the owners will have to pay taxes and the road commission under these will be given the money to spend on the roads. And I for one as the owner of motor car am satisfied to have myself taxed to have better roads for everyone who may care to use them. The hon. member for Burin ought to induce his friends to buy motor cars and I think Mr. Brownrigg will also. I will do my best to have these resolutions apply to Burin.

MR. CHEESEMAN:—Only last week some of the residents of the district of Burin invested in motor cars.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Is there an addition to that (C. sec. 2, resolutions re maintenance of certain roads)?

THE HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE:—Yes. "By the way of Salmonier, Colinet to Placentia."

MR. GOSSE:—Does that include the district of Hr. Grace? (re resolutions in the matter of the maintenance of certain roads) There is a road there going from Spaniard's Bay to Harbor Grace and as was already mentioned to you the people of Hr. Grace are willing to spend so much of their own money if the government will help them out on this road from Spaniard's Bay to Hr. Grace. Doctors sometimes have to go from Hr. Grace to Spaniard's Bay. It is impossible to get to the bottom of the bay with a motor car. They have to drive with a horse and the trip takes seven hours whereas if a motor car could travel on the road it would only require about two hours and a half to get there. The road is known as the New Harbor Road and connects Conception Bay with Trinity Bay.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I may say to Captain Gosse's remarks that this road has been brought to the attention of the Motor Association and

I have no doubt that it will take the opportunity of fixing up this road. And as Mr. Hibbs stated yesterday the people of Hr. Main will be glad to help along the work.

DR. JONES:—I am glad to hear that Harbor Main was represented. I was not here when this matter was in the committee stage but nevertheless am glad to know that the old district was represented. The road Captain Gosse speaks of is quite familiar to me. That road is only part of what I call a perfect drive. You can go along that road to New Hr. and thence to Whitbourne and then back to Holyrood. I called the attention of the House to this before to have this included in this bill. But I notice that these resolutions give very little power to the road commission to enter upon land for the purpose of making roads. This is often essential to make wide and fit enough to drive over. Our people of the bay suffer terribly for the want of roads of sufficient width. There is a certain number using motor cars who are inexperienced and the people of the settlements through which the cars go suffer no little inconvenience. I hope therefore that some of those on the commission will be representatives from the outports. They should be people living there. As I said they are some number of inexperienced drivers and not too few of even the best drivers are reckless when they get to outport roads and I hope to see some of the members of this commission representatives from the districts through which those roads run.

MR. SAMSON:—I consider this bill nothing more than class legislation and I oppose it. Down north there's nothing like the roads the people in the south possess. And until I see that the northern districts are carefully considered and given a share of this legislation I do not intend to favour this bill. Down north we need those roads as dire necessity and not for pleasure as the improvement herein contemplated is for.

HON. SPEAKER:—Before we pass this section I would like to say a word with regard to motorists around the bay. We have some fourteen or fifteen motor owners in Carbonear and if you are going to tax them they should have some representation on this commission. If Carbonear were canvassed you would find some people who would subscribe some money to get the motors off the streets of the town of Carbonear. They consider them a nuisance. The streets are not very wide and a lot of ponies come in there from outside points that are not used to cars, and sometimes they cause a lot of trouble. But there are some roads that would be used by motorists where some money could be spent to great advantage. There is a road from Carbonear to Heart's Delight that ought to be put in better condition; and I commend this to the hon. gentlemen who represent Trinity district. They have considerable difficulty in getting doctors. Provision should be made to have an amount of money spent for this purpose. And, as I said before, if the motorists outside of St. John's are going to be taxed, they should be represented on the commission.

Then there is another matter that I would like to point out. You are coming into Conception Bay and taking charge of the main road monies.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Chairman, that is not the intention. The intention is to work in co-operation with the road boards.

HON. SPEAKER:—That will be different. If they work in co-operation with the road boards it will be all right.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Chairman, I think the road boards outside of St. John's will be represented. It is the intention that the com-

mission have a sort of supervision over the work done. There are many things that the commission will have to look after, such as the getting in of machinery. The Minister of Public Works will be chairman of the commission, and there will be other outport representatives on the commission. The commission is to see that good value is received for the money spent.

MR. SMALL:—Mr. Chairman, I object to this section (section 6) on principle. I don't see why we should come in here and vote one-half of the registration fee to be spent by the commission. I move an amendment. Instead of making it one-half make it one-quarter of the registration fee. We must remember that there are a lot of fishermen who need wharfs and then there is the coastal service that must be fixed up. Our first duty is to look after fishermen.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—Mr. Chairman, before these resolutions go thru, I would like to make a few remarks with regard to them. I do not want it to be understood that because I have come here to St. John's to live for a few months I have closed my eyes to the needs of the district that sent me to public life. Now sir, in the greater number of the districts of the country and particularly in Twillingate district, there are many so-called roads which in many cases are the only means of communication by travel between the various places, and these roads—cow paths you would call them here—are in such a condition that you might consider yourself fortunate if you could get over them with knee-fishing boots on, but the people have to put up with them because they are unable to get anything better. There are several reasons for this, one of which is that the soil is of such a nature and the available material is so little suited to the purpose that good roads is almost an impossibility. Another reason is that in a large district like Twillingate, families are constantly going into new localities to settle down, with the result that the amount of the road grants, which has been the same for many years, will not permit of roads being built where they are required, the grants being altogether inadequate for the present requirements. The history of road making in this country has been that small special grants have been obtainable the year before an election and this grant, so far as I have seen, has usually been sufficient to cut down the trees over the line of a proposed new road at which stage the work must be suspended for another four years and on the eve of the next election a similar amount is forthcoming with which a few yards of the road might be built and under these conditions the roads are never completed. I am aware, of course that in many cases the best results are not given for the money expended while this continues. If the government satisfies me that the absolute needs of my district will be attended to I am prepared to support this bill. I don't want to act the part of the dog in the manger and as I understand that the funds which the motorists are asking control of are derived from the taxes paid by them and the duty on the machines coming in the country, I don't see any reason to begrudge them improved roads provided the outport roads will not suffer thereby.

Second reading of bill entitled "An Act to amend the Pilotage Act."

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES:—Mr. Speaker, in asking that this bill be now read a second time, I might state that the only change in the present act contemplated is to increase the pilotage on large steamers from $60 to $80. This is being done at the request of the pilots themselves

and will only affect steamers of very large tonnage and will not apply to the ordinary coastal or other coal steamers.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Speaker, I desire to give this bill my support as I believe the contemplated increase in the pilotage rates of steamers that will be affected by it is a reasonable one and as the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries has pointed out, the increased fee will have nothing to do with the kind of steamer usually coming to this port or engaged in the coastal or passenger service of the colony. At the present time the limit which the pilots receive from a ship of any size is $60 and what is now asked is to have his maximum fee raised to $80. I think that the class of ship coming under this rate, and consequently to be affected by the bill, would be any where from 2,000 or 3,000 tons and larger.

Mr. Fox gave notice of motion.

Sir M. P. Cashin in the absence of Mr. Bennett asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary question on the order paper, May 28th.

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 Provide for the Lighting of Outport Streets," "An Act to amend Chapter 86 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (third series) entitled 'Of Stipendiary Magistrates and Justices of the Peace,'" "An Act for the Confirmation of a Contract with the Susu Shipping Company, Limited," and "An Act to amend Chapter 137 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (third series) entitled 'Of the Fire Control,'" without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the house that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 27 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (third series) entitled 'Of Death Duties,'" with an amendment in which they requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister 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 concerning the Registration of Midwives," with an amendment, in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister 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 amend Chapter 4 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundlnd (third series) entitled 'Of Legislative Disabilities and the Vacation of Seats in the House of Assembly'," with amendment, in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of the Hon. the Prime Minister the said amendment was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of the Minister of Public Works the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Local Affairs Act," was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill en-

titled "An Act respecting Licenses to Cut Hard Woods," 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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act respecting Former Enemy 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.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole to consider certain resolutions respecting the Improvements of Roads.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs 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 to-morrow.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the committee have leave to sit again on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the bill entitled "An Act to amend the Pilotage Act, 1917," was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole house on to-morrow.

Mr. Fox gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled "An Act to amend the Society for Protection of Animals' Act, 1914."

Mr. Vinnicombe gave notice of question.

It was moved and seconded that when the house rises it adjourn until Monday next, the 7th inst., at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The house then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, June 7, 1920.

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

Mr. Vinnicombe:—Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from the City Council and which, with your permission, I will read to the house. (Reads petition.)

MR. ABBOTT:—I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Open Hall in the district of Bonavista Bay. The petition also covers Red Cliffe, Plate Cove, Pick Up Cove and Keels. The petitioners think it expedient that a public wharf be constructed at Open Hall. At the present time there is not a suitable place for the landing of passengers. Open Hall is one of the principal ports of call in Bonavista Bay. Plate Cove, Pick Up Cove, Red Cliffe and Keels can all be benefitted by having a suitable wharf at this Open Hall. The petitioners ask for no specified amount but for whatever is sufficient to construct a public wharf of such dimensions as a bay steamer can come alongside. There is also request embodied in this petition that a man be sent from the Department of Marine and Fisheries to make a survey and give an estimate of the sum required to do the necessary work. The petition is signed by all the electors of Open Hall, Red Cliffe, Plate Cove, Pick Up Cove and Keels. I think this is a request of an absolute necessity and I support it. I ask that it be referred to the department to which it refers and trust that the request shall be acceded to.

MR. WINSOR:—I beg to support the petition presented by my colleague,

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—In the absence of the Prime Minister I may ask the hon. member to let that question stand until to-morrow, (Mr. Vinnicombe's question as to the purchase of Sudbury grounds).

Petitions were presented by Mr. Vinnicombe from Municipal Council re motor tax; Mr. Abbott, from Open Hall, re public wharf.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave notice of question.

Mr. Bennett gave notice of question.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Mr. Fox the bill entitled "An Act to amend the Society for Protection of Animals Act, 1914," was introduced and 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 amend 'The Income War Tax Act, 1910,'" in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the amendment was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the amendment made by the Legislative Council in and upon the bill sent up entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 27 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (third series) entitled 'Of Death Duties,'" 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 said amendment had been agreed to without amendment.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the amendment made by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act concerning the Registration of Midwives" 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 said amendment had been agreed to without amendment.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the amendment made by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 4 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled 'Of Legislative Disabilities and the Vacation of Seats in the House of Assembly," 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 said amendment had been agreed to without amendment.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE (re amendment to Income War Tax Act):—I may say Mr. Speaker, that that amendment is only a technical one. The Act that went to the Upper House was copied from the Resolutions that were before this House and the last section said "that an Act would be introduced to give effect to these Resolutions." This should not have been there; should have been stricken out.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE (re amendment to the Legislative Disabilities Bill):—Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill I may say a section therein which caused a lot of discussion in this House namely one dealing with Mr. Cave's holding office until December 31st, 1920, has been taken out by the Council.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE (re amendment to Midwives Bill):—That amendment Mr. Speaker, empowers the Governor in Council to apply the provisions thereof to such sections of the country as they may deem fit from time to time. In the case of an abortion the Governor in Council will have to step in.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting the improvement of Roads.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—The Committee rose the last session in order that sections three, four and nine of these Resolutions (Re the Improvement of Roads) might be re-adopted. And they refer to the collection of taxes and the amount to be paid to the Municipal Council I think I ought to make some reference to the petition presented this afternoon by the hon. member for St. John's East, Mr. Vinnicombe, on behalf of the Council. There are some parts of that petition or rather the argument for the Council, as put before this House which require an explanation and I propose to give my reasons why I think the money ought to be spent by the Road Commission outside St. John's. I need not go into any length on this matter as it has already been explained and to a great extent the principle has been adopted by the House. In the first place, Sir, I wish to draw your attention to the fact that this petition says that it is proposed to hand over the taxes collected to the Motor Association. Now that is not so. The petition to my mind is trying to create a prejudice against the Motor Association and it is also forgetful of the fact that we propose to improve the roads at our expense so that they will be passable for everybody. Mr. Gosling knew when he wrote this petition that this was incorrect because he happened to be present in this House when those who were interested in the matter and those members who were interested because of the districts through which the motor cars run, were invited to meet a certain afternoon. They were present when it was distinctly outlined that the money collected was not to be handed over to the Motor Association but to the Commission.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—Mr. Chairman, I object to this section. The Council can't do work with no funds, and that has been the great trouble right along. The Municipal Council thought that they ought to have all the money collected as taxes on motors because the cars are owned in St. John's and are operated for the most part in St. John's. At the present time we have a large number of motor trucks that never go outside of St. John's, and the taxes collected from these will go to build roads in other places. I object to this $6000.00 or any definite sum be named. The taxes collected from motor trucks should go to the Municipal Council entirely, and there should be a certain per cent of the other taxes turned over to the Council. As it is now if next year or in a few years time there are three times as many cars as there are at the present time the Council will still get the $6000.000 and no more. The Council ought to get a certain per cent so that the amount will increase with the number of cars. I am in favor of this bill. I would like to see something done with the roads, but as a representative of St. John's East I object to that section, and will not be satisfied unless some amendment is made.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—The main point of his argument is contained in his next argument regarding the division of taxes. I may say that when I was in the House before it was on my motion that the taxes were divided. I represented Port de Grave district. Port de Grave is a small district, and has many roads some of which are used considerable by the motorists from St. John's. The first week of the session of the Legislature

two motor cars went over the bridge that divides Port de Grave district from Harbor Main district and broke it down. Now, as the motor cars are using these roads it is only right that they should be taxed to repair them.

Now as to Mr. Gosling's argument that the cars are owned by St. John's people and the tax should go to repair roads in St. John's, I would like to point out that while the cars are owned by people of St. John's for the most part they tear up the roads and break down the bridges outside of St. John's and the tax on the cars should go to make the necessary repairs.

Then he contends that most of the use of cars is in St. John's. I contend that that is not so. If a car run 5000 miles in a year you will find that 3000 miles are outside of St. John's.

The next section is absolutely dishonest, and Mr. Gosling knew when he wrote it that it was absolutely untrue. If motorists want to increase their taxes they reap the benefit, but other people reap the benefit also. Mr. Gosling forgets the fact that if the motor cars were confined to St. John's they would decrease in number. We are trying to make it worth while for a man to have a motor car—the more cars the more revenue. The object that we have in view is that the money should be handed over to the commission, and that the Council be paid **$6000.00 annually to be spent by the** Council.

SIR. M. P. CASHIN:—Mr. Chairman, while we are on the subject of roads I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works on whose recommendation the new boards were recently appointed in Ferryland District, and also **if it is true that the large bridge at** Aquaforte has been burned. We have been particularly unfortunate in that district this year in the matter of fires, due altogether to the fact that the firewardens who were usually appointed early in May have all been dismissed without any steps having been taken to replace them. Now, if matters are left to take their own course in this way forest fires are inevitable because along the line of railway the old grass is like tinder and as soon as a spark from an engine touches it there is a blaze. Since the railway has been in operation in that district wardens have been appointed as a protection against just such danger and each day at this time of the year they rode on the trains from place to place, dropping off at the grades and walking back over the track to put any fires that might have been caused by sparks. In this way forest fires and consequent destruction of valuable timber was averted. This year as I have stated the old wardens were dismissed and no others appointed, with the result that every stick of timber from Chance Cove to Aquaforte has been destroyed. LaManche Woods have been burning for the past ten days but no notice of it has been taken by the Agriculture Dept., and yesterday the people of Witless Bay had to get out with axes and cut down the trees surrounding the place to save the church and convent from being burnt down. All recommendations to have something done in this matter have been totally ignored and the only steps that have been taken were to appoint a **few wardens who have now gone to the** fishery and these men, I understand, are receiving salaries altho they are not there at all. There is nobody in this House to answer for the Agricultural Dept. but I serve notice that Ferryland district is burning from end to end and miles of valuable timber being destroyed while even the settlements themselves are in danger in many sections. If wardens had been appointed when they should have been, we wouldn't have this mess to-day. I would ask the Minister of Public Works again if he has any report of

Aquaforte Bridge having been burned, and I would also like to know, as he was very strong on the point of not sending out money to improperly constituted Road Boards, how did he dismiss the old boards in Ferryland district and by what authority or on whose recommendation were the new ones appointed, and further how much money has been sent out to these boards for expenditure on the roads. I understand that hundreds of dollars have been spent on some of the roads while no money has actually been sent out by the Public Works Dept., and that there are hundreds of men employed at the present time.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—Mr. Chairman, the Leader of the Opposition has given me rather a difficult task to answer so many questions offhand but nevertheless, I think I can give him the answers, at least to most of his questions. With regard to the matter of Road Boards, when the conclusion was arrived at that there should be elective road boards in that district, the Dept. of Public Works had the advice of the Minister of Justice and it was decided to appoint boards pro tem, **it being not advisable to have monies** expended under the old boards and the time not being opportune for the holding of the elections. The list of the boards was sent over to the Public Works Dept. from the Colonial Secretary's Dept. In answer to the second question, I would say that I received a report about Aquaforte Bridge this morning and Capt. Bonia was immediately sent out to see what could be done to replace it. As to the matter of wardens, the Public Works Dept. has nothing to with them. I cannot answer the question regarding the money sent out to Ferryland district now but if the hon. member will put it on the order paper he will receive his answer in the usual way. I think, however that the statement about hundreds of men being employed is incorrect.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—There are at least a hundred men at work out there.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—I think that is incorrect.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—I am not thinking at all; I know what I am talking about and I am sure that what I **have said is correct, and furthermore,** I consider the answer of the Minister of Public Works to my question with regard to the road boards a very flimsy excuse and when he sent out money he should have known to whom he was sending it.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—There was no money sent out, and any expenditures that were made or repairs attended to were done under the supervision of Capt. Bonia.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—There must be at least a thousand dollars spent there already and not under the supervision or on the recommendation of Capt. Bonia who was in Bay de Verde district. This money has been spent from Tor's Cove to Ferryland and if the Minister does not know about it I can tell him. Here's what happened. A defeated candidate who polled three hundred votes in the idstrict last fall came in here and said that if he was not given the money to spend he would get the work done on credit, and he was told to go ahead with it.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—I might say that I have not the slightest knowledge of anything of the kind.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Then you are not attending to the affairs of your department or you would know what was going on. Mr. Hartery, a defeated candidate comes in here and is authorized to put men to work on the roads and you know nothing about it.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—If Mr. Hartery is doing this, all I can say is that he has no business to do it.

MR. MOORE:—Mr. Chairman, I

drove thirty miles yesterday thru that section where the fires are raging in the district and I want to say here that it is a shame and a scandal to have this splendid timber destroyed and settlements in danger of being wiped out and not a move being made by the Government to prevent it. It is nothing but neglect of the first order, but this is the kind of thing that one would expect to be handed out to Ferryland district. As to the work on the roads, the Minister of Public Works need have no doubt about the truth of what my colleague, Sir Michael Cashin has stated. Men are at work on the road between Tor's Cove to Ferryland and we know who is employed there and if the Minister doesn't know anything about it, then I am sorry for his department. Now Sir, there is not a cent being spent from Tor's Cove to St. John's, and I trust that the Minister of Public Works will look into this and that he will not let the matter rest where it is but see to it that the facts are enquired into and be in a position to give us some information when he comes in here again. I would also say to the Minister that I hope when the bills come before him for the work now being done, he won't pay them without being satisfied as to the authorization for the work.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—I would go further than that and ask the Minister if he is not satisfied that my statements are correct to send out an official of his department to-morrow in a car or carriage and find out for himself.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—I can assure both Sir Michael Cashin and his colleague that not one cent has been authorized by my department for the work he speaks of.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—I believe you, but the work is being done nevertheless and you ought to know it but the thing has been done over your head and you are merely being used. It is an insult to Ferryland district and is being done for political spite.

MR. BENNETT:—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works what is to be the policy with regard to the expenditure of the district grants and what arrangements is being made to have them spent in such a way as to prevent them from conflicting with expenditures under this Act. Is it the intention to pool the grants with the money that will be expended by the Commission? It appears to me something should be done, some policy adopted to deal with this matter, otherwise there is bound to be conflict.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—I don't know if any such step as the hon. member refers to has been considered yet but certainly something will have to be done in this way and I think that will be easily arranged when the proper time comes.

MR. BENNETT:—I presume that is the reason why nothing has been done yet this season to have the roads in the district of St. John's West attended to. Yesterday I was over a portion of that district and the roads are in a frightful condition and are in very urgent need of repairs. Of course, it might be said that the grants are not yet available as the Supply has not yet been passed, but it has been the practice to make provision for this in the past and there is no reason why the same thing cannot be done now.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—I might say that already the per capita grants have been practically expended and I am looking forward to having the annual grants sent out next week. The officials are now at work making up the allotments. They are beginning with the northern districts and working up around to the western sections and I expect the St. John's grants will be sent out about Thursday next.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—To get back to the Road Resolutions I am prepared to allow the tax on 30 motor trucks now in use in the city to be collected by the City Council. Thirty motor trucks at $35.00 would give an income of $1,050. It could be increased to $50.00 and this would give an income of $1,500. I am prepared to make this $5,500 to the Council and they can in future have the tax on motor trucks.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—I quite agree with that. The trucks are used only in the city.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Chairman, it is rather difficult to say what method of reconciliation can be used in reference to the suggestions made by the Hon. Minister of Justice. I think it is as fair a way as can be worked out. I can't disassociate myself with the outside parts of the district of St. John's East. Levys are made in the town for every kind of citizen for water taxation, etc., and the levy referred here to to-day is for a particular right to drive a car. It should be a right to drive in the country at large. It is an unsound principle to say that the taxes taken from a big 75 horsepower car should be collected and given to the city of St. John's when all the roads outside the district altogether are frequently being used by that car. It is unjust and unsound. It is only proper that some provision should be made to enable them this idea to be extended as it ought to be extended. The main point is that we have got to make the man who buys a car feel that he is paying a national tax. The great trouble is, taking St. John's East for example, the road grants are insufficient to carry on the work that has been made necessary by the influx of heavy motor traffic, and I think that it is quite proper to make the exception as far as motor trucks are concerned because they are practically all confined to St. John's. In future the Council will have the grant of nearly $6,000 and the taxes collected on trucks. I support these resolutions because in my judgment they are the only means of strengthening the grants. I don't think it would be possible for the Council to put into force an increased taxation like this, because the car owners would expect improvements that would be something to make.

MR. BENNETT:—Mr. Chairman, I think that there is a great deal of force in what Mr. Vinnicombe has said with regard to money collected on motor cars being handed over the City Council, and as has been pointed out by him they certainly have a very strong claim, because, when one realizes that while there is a certain amount of use given to country roads by motor cars, it is the city roads that have to bear the brunt of it, and they therefore should receive consideration. But what is underlying this I take it that the object, is not the improvement of city streets, but country roads, and the Motor Association have offered to tax themselves, for a special purpose, and they should have the opportunity of seeing in what direction the money will be spent. It is quite true, that the Government intend to subsidize this, and give half to the upkeep of roads outside the city. This is justifiable, because motor car owners will get the advantage of the roads, and the public will get the advantage, and therefore, the country will be getting an advantage that they would never otherwise have. Now Sir, I can understand that in the minds of some of the representaves of districts in this House there is an objection to grants being given to districts in the immediate vicinity of St. John's, that is understandable, but I would like to say that the roads in the city receive only the per capita grant allowed to all districts, and when one realizes the amount of wear and tear

that they have to bear that this grant is not sufficient to keep them up. It is quite impossible to keep the roads in repair, because traffic has been so accentuated by the advent of motor cars that the grants are not near enough for the requirements. I certainly endorse these resolutions, and while I would like to see the city get as much as possible, in view of the amendment made by the Minister of Justice, I think that the best possible has been done.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—Mr. Chairman, like the speaker who preceded me, I am a representative of St. John's East, but I am also a representative of the city, in the City Council. When I came here this afternoon I tried to do **all I could for the city, and I think it is** my place to do that. There is six thousand dollars grant for St. John's, and I claim that as there is a large increase in the number of motor cars each year that this grant is not enough to make up for the wear and tear on the city roads by the motor cars. You can go up middle street any day you like and you will hardly be able to pass there with motor cars and carriages. I came here to fight to get what I could for the city, and now that they will be granted fifty-five hundred dollars, along with all taxes on motor trucks, I might say that I am perfectly satisfied.

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 Maintenance of certain Public Roads" was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Pilotage Act, 1917."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

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

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

Second reading of an Act "Of the Prosecution of the Seal Fishery."

MR. FOX:—Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this, I would say, that certain portions of this Bill came before the Legislature, some years ago. These portions are the sections that relate to the food and maintenance of the crew. Sections dealing with the fare and maintenance of the crew was brought up this year because of certain facts that came to the notice of the Colony, and were brought to my notice in particular. The law says that a certain amount of food has to be apportioned to the sealers every day. There is nobody held responsible to see that these regulations are carried out, and it is a matter of indifference to the master and officers, whether or not they are carried out. The condition of the quarters of the crew are such that it is time that someone took a hand to see that these quarters are kept clean. Facts were laid before me that proved that absolutely intolerable conditions prevailed, and if something is not done in this matter, an epidemic will break out, and spread through all parts of the country. From such of this information I have received I can hardly conceive that such disgusting conditions could obtain on board these steamers. The position is that nobody cares whether the mens' sleeping quar-

ters are clean or not, the master has other duties to attend to, and the men are left at the mercy of anybody that cares to look out for them, and in many cases there is no one to keep the quarters clean. When I asked why this was, I was told that in a great many cases the men themselves are to blame. The position I take on this matter is, that if these quarters are not kept clean, and if under certain conditions the men are to blame, this legislature should take the responsibility of protecting them against themselves.

The object of this bill is to have an inspector appointed, one for each steamer. He will see that the regulations with regard to food, and maintenance of the crew, are carried out, and he will have the authority to inspect the sleeping quarters of the men, and appoint a man to keep them clean. If anybody violates these regulations on reach port he will prosecute. In those sections dealing with the care and maintenance of the crew, I am sure that the House will endorse my views on the subject, and try to make conditions tolerable for the men on those steamers.

The second section limits the time for the prosecution of the seal fishery. Under the present law we have no close season. All we have is the provision that seals shall not be killed, before such a date, but the law does not say that no seals shall be killed after a certain date.

Sections three, four and five are merely formal, having the effect of rounding out the bill. I have no doubt that this bill will cause some discussion in the Committee stage. I ask leave to move the second reading of this bill.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Mr. Fox the Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 162 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Prosecution of the Seal Fishery'" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Minister of Public Works, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Local Affairs in Outport Districts" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Second reading of Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Local Affairs Act."

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, I might say that the amendments made only deal with some minor matters that we consider would make the Act more workable. I have arranged to have copies of the old Act distributed among the members so that they will be able to see where the amendments came in. I might say that when the Bill goes into Committee of the Whole House there may be other amendments that will be found necessary to add. In fact since the Bill has been in the hands of the printer there are two or three small matters in connection with it that I consider should be changed, and I shall take the privilege of mentioning those matters when in Committee.

The first amendment, it will be noticed, is in sub-section (1) of section (7), which makes it legal for a Stipendiary Magistrate to hold more than one meeting at the same date. In some districts this is impossible, but in other districts it is quite feasible. This amendment is the outcome of an election that was held over in Harbor Main district where the Stipendiary Magistrate was instructed to hold meetings in three or four different places, whereas, under the Act he could not hold meetings outside the particular area where he resided. The reason we found it necessary to have Stipendiary Magistrates to hold meetings is because they

are best fitted for the work and because there would be less trouble arise therefrom, so that we amended the Act giving Stipendiary Magistrates authority to hold three or four meetings on the same date, where possible.

The next amendment is in sub-section (2) of the same section and it reads as follows:

"If any such meeting is not held at "the proper time or at all, or is clearly "irregular, or is in any way held or "conducted in contravention of the pro- "visions of this Chapter or is void "thereunder, the Minister of Public "Works may declare the election void "and order a new election to be held "within two weeks after the holding of "such meeting, or the date when it "should have been held, and ten days "notice of the holding of such new "election shall be given, as provided in "sub-section (1) (d) of this section."

The idea of that section is to give the Minister of Public Works authority to interfere and order another election in the event of a meeting being held irregularly or that something improper has happened at any such meeting. Another small amendment is in sub-section (d). Instead of two weeks notice for the convening of a meeting, ten days is provided. Section (8) is amended by striking out the words "two months" and substituting therefor the words "one month," and by inserting after the word "day" in the second line, the words "in November or December." We thought this time of the year would be better for the holding of elections in the interests of the several districts, as at this time of the year the majority of the people are home. Section (26) is amended to have duplicate returns sent to all the Boards by the Board of Works Department for the purpose of showing the returns of elections held, which shall be filled in by the Chairman, and of which one copy shall be forwarded by him to the Department of Public Works and the other posted in a public place for inspection. We consider it will be a great preventative against irregular expenditure to have these returns posted in the localities where the money is spent. Section (50) provides to whom the money shall be sent. For ordinary public works the money is to go to the Boards; and whilst it is thought, perhaps, that the Act specially provides that all public monies should go to those Boards, yet sub-section (B) of section (50) makes this very clear. However, the main object of the amendment is to deal with any public works needing expert management and that the Board cannot undertake, as sub-section (2) says:

"In the case of any area in which work of an unusual nature is to be done, requiring for its proper performance the direction of an expert or experts, the Governor in Council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Public Works, may pay over the said votes and grants, or any portion thereof, either to the Superintendent of Public Works, or to the Government Engineer, or to any Road or Marine Works Inspector or any other person or Commission appointed by him for that purpose, in lieu of paying the said moneys or the said part thereof to the Board. The moneys so paid shall be controlled by the person or persons to whom they are paid and expended upon the work done as aforesaid under his or their supervision."

This will deal with every public work like the building of a breakwater or pier, or the deepening of a Tickle or anything that requires the services of an engineer.

Turning over to section three of the Act there is another amendment that deals with certain troubles that arise in isolated places in the country and one particular case came under my notice since last winter in Parsons' Pond in

the district of St. Barbe. They asked for the privilege to elect a Board, but as they were only forty families in the place, under the Act, they could not be given a Board. They are a distance of twelve miles from Cow Head where there is a Board and we could not expect them to undergo the hardship of walking twenty-four miles to attend a meeting at Cow Head. And there are other places where thirty and forty families reside who would like to have their own money to handle in the best way possible. The amendment will meet these conditions. There are not many cases of this nature, probably a dozen altogether were brought under my notice. The last amendment is for the purpose of having all the elections in future held on the same date. As the matter stands now the Boards elected last February and last fall their time expires now. Other amendments that are thought desirable can be made when the Bill goes into Committee stage. Already I have some myself to submit to the House.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Speaker, I have just a word or two to say not so much in regard to the measure before the chair, but rather as an excuse to draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to conditions over at Bell Island with regard to local affairs. Matters there are going to reach a very awkward stage unless something is done and done immediately. I have already drawn the attention of the Prime Minister to this matter, but now that he is not present this afternoon I will bring it under the notice of the real Leader of the Government, who is present and ask him as well as the Minister of Public Works to consider the matter. The situation over there, as the Minister of Public Works is aware, is that the marine and road grants have been distributed between two Councils; Lance Cove, where the third Council is, are petitioning that there is no one attending to their affairs at all. The Minister himself obliged them by sending Captain Bonia to Lance Cove to report upon the matter.

I would like also to say to the honourable the minister in charge that I think we ought to avail of the opportunity with a certain section in the old Local Affairs Act. It is too bad that it was passed by the House as it was. I remember when section three was passed and one would want to be a Philadelphia lawyer to understand it. It is really a disgrace because perhaps we did not give it honest attention and perhaps the honourable minister then was not as keen as the present one. Section three really means nothing. Now is the time to make any amendment and that is why I draw the attention of the honourable minister to it. It is a disgrace to the legislature and I feel sure that when the matters comes before the House it will be done credit to by the Honourable Minister of Justice.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—I may say in reply to the honourable member for St. John's East, that I shall be only too pleased to have legal advice to make it harder to understand. In reference to Bell Island I may say that a while ago I understood they were not satisfied to act any longer. However I learned lately that they have reconsidered their decision and will act until the Fall. Under those circumstances the grants for Bell Island will go to the Council.

MR. McDONNELL:—I would like to call the attention of the Honourable the Minister of Public Works to section four of sub-section two. It deals with our old friend the expert. Just reading it casually it appears to me that the Governor in Council can at any time replace the local road board by handing over the matter to some one called an EXPERT. We have some kind of a system whereby a road board is elected

to do certain work but now altho it may be duly elected the work may be done by the so-called expert. I will oppose this when it comes before the House, in committee stage. I view those experts with holy horror. We have had them here on Water, Agriculture, and Model Farms and now we come in here with another expert. This expert is to take the place of the duly elected road board. I ask the minister not to bring this in or else define what this expert is, etc. I think section six which says that all elections shall be held on the same day is all right and go further and say that something should be put in that section saying who will select that day. At present it is selected haphazardly. The Minister of Public Works should have power to select the day. I shall have more to say about this when it comes again before the House in committee stage.

MR. FOX gives notice of introduction of Bill.

THE HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE gives notice of introduction of Bill.

MR. BENNETT:—I would like to ask the Honourable Minister of Posts and Telegraphs if he has that answer to my question re the postmistress at Tilton?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS:— Imay say in connection with the postmistress at Tilton that her services are no longer required and that it is in the interest of the district that she no longer retain that position.

Mr. Fox gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 3 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland entitled 'Of the Election of Members of the House of Assembly.'"

Mr. Fox gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Commemoration Day."

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave t ointroduce a Bill entitled "An Act to amend 9 & 10 Geo. V Cap. XV Respecting Elections in the Present Year."

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, June 8th, 1920.

The House met pursuant to adjournment.

MR. SMALL:—I ask leave to present a petition from the residents of Cape Ray asking that station agent be appointed there. It is signed by practically all the people of the settlement. The station is one mile from the settlement and it was built for an agent but apparently it has not been seen fit to put one there. It is really an necessity. When freight in the past has been put there it was pilfered. I trust the Colonial Secretary will do something in the matter and I support the petition.

CAPTAIN JONES:—I present a petition from the inhabitants of several settlements on the north side of Twillingate district. It asks that a railroad be built from Hall's Bay to the Main Line. It was proposed in the past to build this line and ever since the people down there have been talking about it among themselves about the proposed railroad but never took an active interest in it until the present time and ever since we have been talking about it but it has not been built yet. And we have been told and may be persuaded that it is impossible to build this railway at the present time under the existing conditions such as the high cost of material and labour. Any way I and my colleagues ask that if it is impossible to build this railway we may be accommodated with a decent road. So much has been said and leg-

islation passed dealing with motor roads we have decided that if it is impossible to have this railway certainly the people ought to have a motor road so that we can travel and carry light freight. In the fall of the year we have to get as best we can supplies for the winter. It is true we get the necessaries of life and how we do that is a matter of conjecture. Anyway we have been short of many things we require. Many people have been short of supplies, sugar and butter. Some people have tried to get their supplies over the railroad. They have paid the freight as far as Millertown Junction, and it has cost them 7 cents a pound to get it from there, so that to the present cost they have been obliged to add 7 cents per pound.

Then again there is the travelling condition. I will quote one instance to show the actual conditions. The Fall before last the Prospero took a cargo of herring at Little Bay Islands, and two young men finding that they had a nice bill at their disposal came to St. John's for a two or three weeks' holiday. On returning they had engaged a dog team to take them from Millertown Junction. The team cost them $50.00 and they had to put on snowshoes to make a path ahead of the dog team. At the very cheapest rate it costs $20.00 to get from the head of the Bay to the Junction at Millertown. In winter and spring there is always great inconvenience in travelling. We get a mail about once in fifteen or twenty days in the fall and spring. If we cannot get a railroad, there is no reason why we could not get a motor road. I thought from some of the remarks that were passed here regarding the improvements of roads that may be we would have to get some cars before we would get the road, but I hope it will not be as hard as that. There are many thousands of people who would be benefitted by this road. If a road were built many cars would be bought and the revenue increased. I have no objection, whatever, to the people in St. John's having good motor roads for whatever pleasure there is in it, as I have shown by not raising any objection, but I trust, and I appeal to hon. members that are citizens of St. John's that they will support this

Then again there are valuable mineral claims along this road. Mr. Speaker, you may have heard of the Gull Lake mineral claim. Two local men have recently gone to New York and made arrangements with a company there for the opening up of this claim; but the claim is about 20 miles from the road and the first thing they want is a road to enable them to get supplies to begin with. I hope the Government will see its way clear to grant this petition.

HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the prayer of this petition. I do so because I know of the great need for a road in this place. It is reported that our opponents went around last fall with a railroad in their pockets, and I suppose that is one reason why they should have been elected instead of our humble selves. A road should be put there to take freight to and from Millertown Junction. The herring fishery cannot be carried on at the present time to make it pay unless the people have some outlet for their products. I hope the Government at the earliest possible convenience will grant the prayer of this petition.

MR. SAMSON:—Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of this petition as it has already been explained. It is a very great necessity, and I wish to give it my very hearty support.

MR. HIGGINS gave notice of question.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN gave notice of question.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY:—

The property in question was purchased from Mrs. Thompson for the sum of $29,000.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked the Hon. Minister of Justice if the Commission promised to inquire into the Woodford Affidavit are yet appointed, if not, why not.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I would ask the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to allow that question to remain over till to-morrow.

SIR M. P. CASHIN, inthe absence of Mr. Bennett, asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay on the Table of the House a certified copy of Minute constituting the present Board of Review of Separation Allowances, giving date when said Minute was passed.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY:—I have here the Minute of Council which is dated Dec. 16th, 1919, and approved by His Excellency the Governor December 17th. I may say that Mr. Hickman was consulted and he said that he considered the sum of $250.00 for the work done reasonable and just.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked the Colonial Secretary what action the Agriculture and Mines Department have taken to stop the forest fires along the Southern Shore, have they sent out any person from the Department to enquire and report, give the names of wardens appointed from St. John's or temporary warden, and table the report sent in from each warden.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY:—I beg to table the information which has been handed to me by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked the Minister of Public Works to table the amount of money allocated for road work in Ferryland district, both local and main line, since April 1st to date, giving the names to whom allocated.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—I beg to table the reply.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to table the report of the Militia Dept. covering the period from April 1st, 1919, to March 31st, 1920, and also the Financial Statement from July 1st, 1918, to June 30th, 1919.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Mr. Speaker, I have received no answer to the question I asked the Minister of Public Works. Why I asked that question yesterday was because in the District of Ferryland an immense amount of work has been done on the roads the past fortnight. The main line road from Tor's Cove to Aquaforte has been gone over completely and been repaired and it was never in better condition than it is right now. I understand the work is being looked after by Mr. Hartery, my opponent in the last election, who came to St. John's and was authorized to undertake these repairs. I think I am safe in saying that he must have hundreds of men employed out there and surely goodness it is not possible that all this has been done without the knowledge of the Minister of Public Works whose department has the absolute control and direction of such work as is now being done. Some individual must have authorized it and the answer handed me by the Minister is a reply to a question I asked in this House a month ago and this work has been undertaken within the past fortnight. Mr. Hartery has been authorized to spend certain monies with the understanding that payment is to be made by the Government after the Estimates are passed and it is not alone curious that the Minister of Public Works is ignorant of this, but it is placing him in an extremely humiliating position to have this thing taken completely out of his hands and I would like to know whether or not he really knows anything about this work.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—I might say that I have no further information to give the hon. member on

that point. If any work is being done it has not been authorized by my department and no money has been allocated for it.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Do I understand that the Public Works Department will pay for this work when the vote is passed. Are you in a position to say that you will not authorize the payment of the bills?

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—It will have to receive a certain amount of consideration but I am not prepared to stand for anything of this kind and if Mr. Hartery has done the work referred to by the Leader of the Opposition, he will have to pay for it out of his own pocket so far as my department is concerned.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—I am glad to hear you say that. I look upon you as one of the most honest men in this House and I hope you wont allow yourself to be made a tool of in this matter. As I pointed out yesterday, Ferryland District is being prostituted for the sake of satisfying political spite. The Government has taken upon itself to dismiss the fire-wardens there with what we now know to be disastrous results and then they go to work and dismiss the Road Boards. I recommend that wardens be appointed and I do so again. I don't care whom you appoint so long as they will do the work. They should have been appointed early in May when fires usually start. Since the railway has been operating in Ferryland District nothing has ever happened like what is occuring now. Men were always appointed to patrol the line from Trepassey to the Goulds and it took all their attention to prevent fires from starting by sparkes lodging in the dead grass along the side of the track. Now, what is the position to-day? All that splendid forest on the banck of Chance Cove is burning and the woods on the back of LeManche are in flames and this is the principal timber limit in the district where fishermen from all over the district go for fishing material, boat-building timber, spars, etc., but no step has been taken to deal with the situation. The district is being practically burnt from end to end, I ask is this the way these people should be treated? In Witless Bay on Sunday, the whole congregation had to get out with buckets and axes to save their church and convent from destruction and the same conditions prevailed at Mobile; still the Agriculture and Mines Department did not even send a man to enquire into the danger that existed. I must say, however, in fairness to Dr. Campbell that he appointed a couple of wardens out there as soon as I wired him on Sunday and they did immense good too, but they should send out a special man to patrol the whole district.

Second reading of Council's amendments to "Income War Tax Act."

On motion of Hon. Minister of Justice these amendments were read a second time and ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

Third reading of Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Pilotage Act, 1917."

On motion of Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries this Bill was read a third time and ordered to be engrossed and sent to the Legislative Council with a message asking the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Committee of the Whole on Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 162 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Prosecution of the Seal Fishery.'"

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of Committee.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Chairman, as I stated yesterday, the necessity of having the present sealing law amended to the extent provided for in this Bill,

was brought home to me on the occasion of certain prosecutions a short time ago and accordingly this Bill was drafted with the concurrence of the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Sub-section 7 is amended as follows:

The effect of this will be that no steamer shall be able to clear for the sealfishery unless she has the quantity and quality of food on board to meet the requirements of the Act

Amendments—

Reading of Bill—

MR. SULLIVAN:—I think Mr. Chairman that it is absolutely necessary for the inspectors to visit quarters not twice a week but twice a day. I am in favour of the Bill and I think it is time to appoint such men, but if they are going to inspect quarters twice a week it would be just as well to keep them on shore.

MR. FOX:—You will find that the amendment makes it read "once a day."

MR. SULLIVAN:—Mr. Chairman, might I ask if it is the intention that if a man be guilty of keeping his quarters dirty that he is liable to a fine of $100 or imprisonment and that half of the fine is to go to the inspector.

MR. FOX:—It is absolutely necessary to have somebody responsible to see that the quarters are kept clean. The members of the crew will only be too glad to keep their quarters clean and the one hundred dollars is a maximum penalty.

MR. SULLIVAN:—I quite agree with the intention alright but you are giving the inspectors too much power. Why should any of the fine be given to an inspector. He is going out there and he is having a cushy job and is getting the same share as the other men, and you are practically giving him a chance of bringing in fictitious claims.

MR. HIGGINS:—I support the contention of the hon. member for the district of Placentia and St. Mary's. I am glad to see we have a Coaker on this side of the House and that he is following in the footsteps of the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries in bringing in fishery legislature, but I am sorry that he has the autocratic manner of the Hon. Minister. I must say that I am surprised that my colleague for St. John's East is bringing in such legislation.

Committee on amendments to Public Affairs Act.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—

Mr. Chairman, in sub-section (3) I would like to have the words added: "That no fee be charged for convening a meeting." I find that some of the parties who authorized the holding of such meetings in the past used to charge five dollars. The expenses of such meetings are supposed to come out of the grants. I do not think it is fair for any Magistrate to make a charge. I might say that no case in which a Chairman of a Road Board charged came under my notice.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Chairman, with regard to the suggestion of the Hon. Minister, I do not think it is fair to expect a Magistrate to do work that is not part of his magisterial duties. Take the highest judiciary in the country to-day, anything he does outside his regular judicial work he is compensated for it. The Magistrate who sits in the Magistrate Court in St. John's at an ordinary Marine Court of enquiry expects to be compensated for it. You cannot expect him to do the work for nothing. Fortunately, the principle in this Bill does not affect the Magistrate here,, and the reason why I discuss it in an abstract way is that it is not likely to give much worry in the territory in which I am interested. Besides the Chairmen of Road Boards are paid already for that kind of work, however small. I would like to say to the Minister that this principle is very

drastic to foist all sorts of work upon an outport Magistrate, and I think it would be unwise to adopt that principle.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—Suppose we specified a certain fee, say two dollars.

MR. HIGGINS:—I am not opposing the Bill, but I merely advise the Minister to consider this matter carefully before putting it in the Bill, and I say this with some little knowledge of how Magistrates are going to feel about the matter.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—I see some reason why Justices of the Peace should be paid for doing this kind of work because they are not paid any regular salary; but in regard to Magistrates, people look upon them in the outports as being able to do this work, without extra charge.

MR. HIGGINS:—I thought that you had become civilized and that your viewpoint had become broadened and enlarged. What happens to-day, under the law. A Magistrate goes on Public Health work or anything of that character and for which he is paid; why inflict road work on him and not pay him. The principle is wrong, but, as I said before, I do not object to it, but I think the Minister is making a mistake.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—I am quite satisfied that Magistrates should not get anything for holding public meetings, but that Justices of the Peace should.

MR. HIGGINS:—I would like to hear the Minister of Justice as to what he thinks of that as a principle.

MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS:—Mr. Chairman, I would like to know what is being done with the point raised by the hon. member for St. John's East, because I think that if somebody does not take an interest in this matter we are going to have another farcical Act tacked on to our Statutes. The attention of the Minister of Justice has been called to this, but there is no response, and that is one of the reasons why there are so many unworkable Acts on our Statute Books. I think that the imposition of a fine of $100 on a Chairman for failing to elect a Road Board will be found unworkable. It is no use to get a man to do this sort of work and subject him to a fine, because it shows that the interest of the people in the management of their own affairs is at a low ebb. When a Justice of the Peace gets his appointment he considers there is a little honor to it at first, but after a month or two he finds it a sort of trouble and annoyance to him because he does not get paid for work that he is called upon to do, and, under this section of the Act, if he does not feel inclined to convene a meeting and act as Chairman of a Road Board, he is fined $100. With regard to Magistrates, it may be alright, perhaps, for them to take the work to do, without fee.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—With regard to this form, the reason this was included is because people in the past who were instructed to hold elections neglected to do so and gave no valid reason for such neglect. It is quite easy for a man, who does not feel inclined to act, to inform the Public Works Department to that effect, and, under the Act, he has the privilege to hold meetings or not, so that another man can be procured. Every chance is given, and the reason why this clause is inserted in the Bill is to deal with people who are careless and who neglect deliberately over those matters.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Chairman, I think that this section should be completely thrown out. It really comes down to the position of frightening people from taking any responsibility in the matter at all, because of the impending fine of $100.

After all, the person primarily responsible for calling a meeting is the Magistrate. Now if a Magistrate does not live within the prescribed area, the duty devolves upon the Justice of the Peace, who does not get paid at all and who does not, as a rule interfere very much, except when specially called upon, therefore, I do not see how you can impose upon a Justice of the Peace duties for the carrying out of which he will not be paid and yet be made liable to a fine of $100. And then after the Justice of the Peace the next man called to perform the work is the Chairman, and, if he does not do it the Minister of Public Works then calls upon some other person to convene a meeting, subjected to a fine for not carrying out the duties properly of course, and the result will be that the Minister will not get anybody to convene a meeting. It will all come down to this that every man will resign rather than render himself liable to the fine mentioned. It is only natural to expect that the Justices of the Peace will resign because he does not get paid and probably there will be no meetings held at all. There are no meetings called off to-day where there is a Magistrate. In Conception Bay I know that the Magistrate takes charge of the thing and does his best to apply his knowledge of the law. Some of them have been irregular and the people have not been satisfied but that can be got over by this section in this Act (Respecting Local Affairs) but as far as the Magistrate is concerned he will do his best. He cannot resign, he gets a salary and he will take his chance. But the people with whom it will be a labour of love will resign rather than get themselves into any difficulty resulting in having to pay a fine of one hundred dollars. And after all I think after one sees all these Road Boards elected by the people the people will be inclined to take to this manner of spending the money rather then handing it over to a few individuals who have been favoured by the members for the district. And I would suggest to the Minister the advisability of not making a penal offence for anybody to neglect this matter because then you will not get anybody to undertake any responsibility of any shape or form.

MR. HIGGINS:—I want to help the Minister out but I will repeat that it is due to this lack of interest in this measure (Respecting the Local Affairs Act) just as the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs illustrates, that it is absolutely necessary that little more thought be given this measure before it is gone through. They are going to pass this measure as it stands but up to the present we are not correcting that which exists to-day. What is really required is this and I address the members opposite because they are vitally concerned in the outports and especially the Minister of Public Works, that the Committee rise so that the matter be gone into to consider the further necessary amendments of these sections which up to the present time have been a joke. I say not in any sense reflecting upon the honourable minister. I defy any man on the other side to tell me what section three means. This is the section which creates the Road Boards and put into operation the necessary machinery and under this the Act is called into being. Now we ought to remedy this senseless section and to do so further amendments are required here and because I know the Minister of Public Works wants to grapple with every difficulty I think it worth his while to have the Committee rise and then have this Act further considered and he will find that very radical changes are required to be made to section three. In order that he might have the opportunity to do that I suggest to him that. As has been remarked here he is per-

haps the only really interested person here because may be of his department. It is only idle for us to sit down here and go on because we will not give the matter the necessary thought and in justice to the members on the other side who represent those districts which require the Local Affairs Act, I repeat to the Minister that the Committee rise.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—I wish to endorse the suggestion made by the late speaker that the Committee rise to give time to further consider the Act. I read it for the first time this morning and I myself could suggest some improvements and therefore endorse the suggestion made by the late speaker.

MR. McDONNELL:—I suggest so that we may get out of the difficulty of the parties resigning just as the Minister of Justice said, that we embody in this Bill that the members of the district go round and hold the meetings. I think this would be a good idea. Then there would be no opportunity to resign to get clear of the fine.

The House adjourned until 3 of the clock on to-morrow.

THURSDAY, June 10th, 1920.

The House met at 3.30 p.m., pursuant to adjournment.

MR. ABBOTT:—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Amherst Cove, in the district of Bonavista, asking for the sum of $200 to repair a washout and replace a landing which was carried away there during a storm. The petition is signed by Joseph Little, Hy. Little and a large number of others.

I also ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Salvage and Bishop's Cove asking for a sum of money for repairs to the road from the East Tickle, Alexander Bay to Tray Town, a distance of six or seven miles. It appears that this road was opened some twenty years ago and nothing has since been done to it altho petitions were sent to previous governments time and again on the matter but were ignored by them. I give the prayer of both those petitions my hearty support and ask that they be referred to the department to which they relate.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present two petitions, one from Flat Islands in the District of Burin and the other from Oderin. The reason why the former was sent to me for presentation is because it deals with the matter on which the people of Oderin are petitioning, namely that of telegraph communication for that place and the people of Flat Islands have been good enough to back up the request by also sending in a petition. Both are largely signed, that from Oderin having the signatures of Rev. Fr. Dee and all the residents of the place. This matter has been before the House on several occasions and has been the subject of constant correspondence for the last three or four years. Now Sir, as many hon. members well know, Oderin is the centre of the large and important parish of Oderin and at present the people suffer very great hardship because of lack of communication.

Oderin is more suitable because at any season it can be approached. I understand that the Prime Minister has had some communications in reference to this matter and I have every confidence that he will make some provision for it in the estimates. Anything that he may do will be absolutely appreciated by the petitioners. I am sure that this will receive the support of the hon. members for Burin and I want to apologize for not dislocating the two petitions and asking them to present one of them, that is the one from Flat Islands. It was only through the courtesy of the people of Flat Islands

that they decided to support the petition of the people of Oderin. I give this my heartiest support and I bespeak the consideration of the Government and I ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SULLIVAN:—I fully endorse all that has been said by my colleague Mr. Walsh in reference to the petition now being presented. Oderin is an island as you know that is most accessible and yet it has none of the conveniences that a great many other such parts of the country are enjoying. It has no communication whatever except a visit from the Argyle about once a week. I think that it should have some means of communication with the outside world. When you come to consider the grave dangers that the inhabitants of Oderin have to contend with in order to follow their work, this can't be done unless their needs are attended to. It is a matter for the Government to decide which they will do. If it is not possible to lay a cable from Flat Islands to Oderin it may be possible to lay one from Oderin to Baine Hr. If this can't be done I ask that one of these small telegraph stations be erected. I bespeak the support of the members of Burin and I know that they will back us up on this petition.

MR. SINNOTT:—I beg leave to support the petition of my colleagues Mr. Walsh and Mr. Sullivan.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I am very happy to have this matter brought to the attention of the Government by the senior member for the district of Placentia and St. Mary's, Mr. Walsh, and in so far as it relates t oa telegraph office for Oderin, but the latter part of the petition cannot be considered at the present time. The island of Oderin is capable of becoming a great centre if it were linked up by cable connection and would prove of great advantage to the colony for the reporting of ships, etc. I met a representative of the Wireless Telegraph Co. who was in town some time ago and discussed with him the feasibility of placing a wireless station at Oderin either telegraph or telephone. I also got in touch with the Anglo-American Telegraph Co. with the object of purchasing some second hand cable in good condition at a reasonable figure, as the cost of new cable would be enormous to-day. I also discussed the probability of placing a chain of small wireless stations in different isolated spots in the colony which would be of great advantage to the trade. The request of the petition relating to the establishing cable connection at Oderin is already granted with a view to developing conditions in this country.

MR. CHEESEMAN:—I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of this petition. I have considerable personal knowledge of Oderin and I am sure if it was in communication with the land there is every prospect that it would some day become the centre of a great fishing industry. Every year the people of Oderin secure a good portion of the catch, they are hard working and industrious people and judging from the remarks made by the Hon. Prime Minister their petition will receive the consideration that it merits. I am very happy to give it my heartiest support.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the hon. member for Placentia, Mr. Walsh, made reference to the very great importance of telegraph connection with the island of Oderin, Placentia. Oderin is an important settlement. Some years ago it was a magisterial centre, but for some time past the magistracy has been vacant, as an effort was being made by the residents of the place to secure a resident medical practitioner at Oderin and if so, it was thought probable that he might be appointed Magistrate. It

is the policy of this Administration to encourage medical practitioners to settle in leading outports, and in the case of a suitable man the appointment as Magistrate would be very helpful. Such a man would naturally by education and training be competent to undertake the duties of a Magistrate and the salary would be an encouragement for him to remain in the district. A few months ago I took into consideration the matter of telegraph connection between Oderin and the mainland. For it to be the place of residence of a Magistrate and Doctor, it is almost imperatively necessary that it should have telegraph connection. Oderin is, I believe, a settlement which if it had telegraph connection might develop into a very important commercial centre. I have discussed with the Superintendent of the Anglo-American Telegraph Company the matter of the cost of cable and find that the price of new cable would be prohibitive. A few weeks ago I learnt that there was a quantity of old cable which would be guaranteed satisfactory for the volume of business to be transacted between Oderin and the mainland that could be obtained at a reasonable figure. I have also had an opportunity of recently discussing the question of installation of a wireless telegraph or wireless telephone between isolated sections of the Island of Newfoundland and the question as to whether it is practical and economical for Oderin to be connected with the mainland by wireless telegraph or wireless telephone is a matter which is being inquired into. I support the prayer of the petition insofar as the petition relates to telegraph connection between Oderin and the mainland. The other portion of the petition relates to a matter of which I have no personal knowledge, and I consequently at this moment can express no opinion on it.

MR. SULLIVAN:—I ask leave to present a petition or at least a number of petitions from the inhabitants of the district of Placentia and St. Mary's on the subject of a modification of the present prohibition laws. This petition is signed by practically all the male inhabitants of Isle of Allan, Bar Haven, River Head St. Mary's, St. Ann's. In view of the fact that up to the present time a great number of petitions for an amendment to the Prohibition Act have been brought into this House nothing has yet been done and they are apparently ignored. The Prime Minister in his Manifesto stated that the present prohibition law was a farce and that it should be amended. I hope that he has not altered his views. The prohibition law as it stands is a farce. It is not what it was anticipated to be when it was placed on the Statute Book and I hope the Government will give due consideration to these petitions.

MR. WALSH:—I have very much pleasure in supporting all that has been said by my colleague Mr. Sullivan and it is only reasonable to suppose that the petitions presented will receive the very serious consideration of the Government, and I hope that some amendment will be made.

MR. SINNOTT:—I have very much pleasure in supporting the petitions presented by my colleague Mr. Walsh.

The House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, on the Bill an Act to amend Local Affairs in Outport Districts.

Mr. Scammell took the chair of Committee.

HON. THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—Mr. Chairman, when I read this Bill the other day, there was some difference of opinion on sub-section three, section one, and the Committee decided to delete that section altogether. As we continue going through the Act the other alterations will be pointed out.

In section four, sub-section one, the

word "annual" is deleted. The word "wharves" is inserted before "Breakwater."

Further on the words requiring for its performance the direction of an expert or experts, are deleted, and it reads: In the case of an area in which work of an unusual nature is done, the Governor in Council on recommendation of the Minister of Public Works, may pay over the said votes and grants, or any portion thereof, either to the Superintendent of Public Works, or to the Government Engineer, or to any Road or Marine Works Inspector, or any other person or Commission appointed by the Minister of Public Works, for that purpose, in lieu of paying the said moneys, or the said part thereof, to the Board. The moneys so paid shall be controlled by the person or persons, to whom they are paid, and expended upon the work, as done aforesaid, under his, or their supervision.

Second reading of Bill entitled "An Act to amend Cap. XV of 9 and 10 Geo. V entitled 'An Act Respecting Elections in the Present Year.'"

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:— This Bill is brief and I feel sure will meet with the unanimous concurrence of the House. The Voters' List used in the 1919 autumn elections was the list taken in the year 1917, together with additional Soldiers' List compiled from the records of the Militia Department. To make the use of these lists legal in the 1919 general elections a special Act was passed in the last session of the Legislature. That enactment deals with elections during "the present year." That might be construed to mean the calendar year of 1919, and probably that is what it means, but in any event it could not be construed to deal with any period beyond the expiry of a year from the fifth day of June, 1919, the Act being assented to on the 5th day of June, 1919. The latter construction was the one which was applied to the Bill for the purposes of the bye-elections through the country in November and the bye-elections in St. John's West in January last. By no construction of the Act, however, is it possible to use the 1917 Voters' List and the 1919 Volunteers' List for the purposes of an election to be held in the District of Bay de Verde on the 24th day of the present month of June. Mr. Hickman, through his solicitor, Mr. McNeily, communicated with His Excellency the Governor lately, taking exception to the use of the 1917 List in the pending Bay de Verde bye-election. Mr. Hickman, it will be remembered, was one of the candidates for the Opposition Party in the autumn election. Mr. McNeily on his behalf, and I presume on behalf of the Opposition, contended that it was undesirable that these lists should be used, suggesting that by their use a considerable number of electors would be disfranchised. The Government felt that the position taken by the Opposition in this regard was reasonable; there had been considerable trouble in the autumn of 1919 and in the January election because of the use of a Voters' List which was three years old. A proclamation was consequently issued calling for the taking of a new Voters' List for the District of Bay de Verde. It was a matter of no importance to the Government as to whether a new Voters' List was taken or whether an Act was introduced extending the operation of the 1919 Act, but in my opinion the taking of a new Voters' List was preferable. The effect of this Act is, first, to legalize the Voters' List which is now being taken, and second, to legalize the use of the special soldiers' list prepared by the Department of Militia in the year 1919 and used in the general election of the autumn of 1919 and the bye-elections in January last. I am quite sure that

the House will recognize this as an absolutely non-partizan measure, and that my honourable friends opposite who are interested in the campaign will on behalf of their candidate realize that this measure is entirely in the public interests. I consequently move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Second reading of Protection of Animals Act.

MR. FOX:—In moving the second reading of this Bill (Of the Protection of Animals) might I say that it has for its object the prevention of certain acts of cruelty. In the past in actions against certain offenders under the act it has happened that altho the Magistrate was anxious to promote the ends of justice he finds he cannot do so because the only way to effect that would be by preventing the offender from owning an animal. Sometimes it has happened that the same offender would be up for acts of cruelty a half dozen times so it has therefore been found by the Society that it is very necessary to have an amendment to the present S. P.C.A. Act to this effect that "In any proceedings for an offence against this Chapter, if the sitting justice shall find that any defendant owning an animal to which the proceedings relate is not a fit person to be allowed to own it, he shall make an order that such animal be confiscated and sold (after one advertisement' at public auction; and the proceeds of such sale (after deducting costs of the proceedings before the justice if ordered, and the costs and expenses incidental to the sale and keep of the animal pending sale) shall be paid to such owner." This merely means that when an owner of an animal takes an animal and continues to ill-treat he is to be prevented from owning it. This does not interfere with the owning of property and will not bear hardly upon the owner of the ill-treated animal because altho it is confiscated the proceeds after deducting certain incurred costs shall be paid to the owner. I feel sure that the House will concur in the humane tendency of this amendment and the amendment will secure the whole support of the Assembly. Section two is merely a formal amendment. Section three is also a formal amendment. It is really an amendment to the main Act. I move the second reading.

Second reading of Woman Suffrage Bill.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Speaker, before this amendment passes, might I say, that I regret very much the attitude of the Government, although it was not unexpected. They played their part in a manner, which I did expect. For example, when a petition from the women of Newfoundland was presented a few weeks ago two honourable and gallant gentlemen on the Government side of the House presented it. They are absent to-day, because they did not want to be here, when they were told how to vote.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. LeGrow, as the sitting member for Bay de Verde, in this House, is in Bay de Verde, now, where his duty lies.

MR. FOX:—Viewing the situation in the light which the Hon. the Prime Minister has thrown upon it, that explains the absence of Mr. LeGrow but, it does not explain the absence of two men, who a few weeks ago, came in here, and gave this petition their support ,and to-day when their presence is more necessary, they refrain from attending.

Now the part that the Hon. the Minister of Public Works has played is one that I did not think he would play. I regret, Sir, that the Hon. Minister has seen well to take the position that he took here this evening; I regret, Sir, that he has indicated so strongly the dependent position that he occupies in

the Government; I regret, Sir, that he and the hon. member for Trinity, have so plainly indicated that when the voice higher up says jump, that they are ready to jump, and further, Sir, I regret that sufficient spirit is not noticeable in the ranks of the Government to make any member on the other side of the House get up and support this petition. It clearly indicates how much right the present Government has to the title of Liberal Reform Party when it refuse to back up the biggest reform movement that the world has undertaken for the past fifty years. It is quite in keeping with the hypocritical attitude of the Government who went to the country last fall with upraised hands and holy faces and who to-day confess publicly that they were not sincere in their protestations of reform last November. In a sense this does not surprise me, but the position taken by the Hon. the Minister of Public Works does surprise me. He would not like anybody to think that he disagrees with the principle of the Bill, but he was too weak-kneed to see it through when he did agree with it. If he is to be taken at his own valuation then once he agreed with the principle of the Bill he should lose no time in having it brought into effect and out of his own mouth he has refuted his argument. Agreeing with the principle necessitates seeing it through and no argument could be adduced for the six months hoist which is proposed to be given it. The Government thinks that there will not be an election before four years pass. It may follow that such is the case but, it may be that the Government is entirely wrong, for all we know we might have an election next Fall, and that is not sufficient excuse for putting this Bill off till the next session of this Assembly. In view of the opinion in favour of this Bill that the Hon. the Minister of Public Works has expressed, how can he reconcile his mind to and what argument can adduce in support of the six months hoist that has been attempted to be given to this Bill. The Government is busy, they have no time to attend to it. The request of the women of Newfoundland is of such a trivial nature and is so entirely inconsequential, that owing to the important business of this session the Govt. has not time to attend to this petition, and yet Sir, we spent only eight hours last week in the transaction of this important business. Last week we spent from six to eight hours in transacting the legislative business of Newfoundland, and during that time the Government could have taken up that Act and passed it if they felt so inclined and it would now be on its way to the Legislative Chamber for approval. The Government has the hypocrisy to say that they have not time, and yet they have time to delay and adjourn this House at four o'clock and four-thirty every afternoon for the past week, they have time to waste hours and hours over unimportant matters, but they have not time to spend an afternoon in dealing with a matter of such grave importance as this measure before the chair. Could hypocrisy go further? Do the leaders of the Government think that the people of Newfoundland are blind? Don't they credit them with some intelligence? Do they think that we can accept the proposal advanced by the Hon. Minister of Public Works on the flimsy excuse that the Government has not time to attend to the Bill? It is too ridiculous, and I only mention it because it is another instance of the hypocrisy of the Government which they displayed so fully last Fall. I always had the idea that the protestations of reform given by the Government last November were shallow and insincere, but I never realized fully until to-day that these gentlemen who went to the country last Fall with upraised hands and holy faces

were hypocrites, or at least there was no evidence of it until to-day. The Government may well recognise that franchise for women is coming. Just as surely as I stand on the floors of this House it is coming, and the day will come when the Government will rue the position they took to-day in this matter. I always thought that the Hon. the Prime Minister was a man of certain political wisdom with a certain happy knack of intuitive insight into matters connected with public life. I never thought he was so blind to his own interests as to comport himself in the manner in which he has to-day and train his party to say no to a petition from the women of the country for what they should have. I am surprised at a man of his intelligence to take such a position and tie the knot which will one day hang him to the political gallows of Newfoundland. Does he not realize, Sir, that the people whom he is turning down have a large amount of influence and that the attitude which he has adopted will bring its own punishment? If he does not, he should, and it is not within my province to point out his error to him. As his political opponent, and trusting that I will continue so, I welcome the attitude of the Government of which he is leader. I see in it, Sir, just another means of one day taking from their hands the reins of office in Newfoundland, but, Sir, in another sense I am surprised and disgusted at the hypocrisy with which they have approached this matter. I am surprised, Sir, that a few weeks ago they could sit down here and say to the supporters of this petition yes, we are in support of your petition, and that two members should get up and support it from their places on the other side of the House and to-day, because it does not fit in with their scheme of political expediency they should deliberately turn it down. Be that as it may, on their own heads be the punishment. The day is coming when the people whom you have turned down will have the power placed in their own hands to take revenge on those who thwarted them in getting rights to safeguard their own interests.

The attitude assumed by the Hon. the Minister of Public Works reminds me of the Mikado, or the Lord High Executioner. It shall not go through because I have not been approached upon the matter. Curfew shall not ring to-night because he does not draw the string. Does he think that the women of his district cannot formulate a request without first getting his consent? Does he think that the women of Newfoundland must do without the vote unless he is approached in a manner becoming to his exalted position? Does he think that there must be a train of women waiting upon him before this measure can receive the consideration of this Assembly. He knows that this petition does receive the attention, and has received the support of the women of Twillingate, and he was only burking the issue when he attempted to get out of a disagreeable situation caused by his playing the part he was told to play in this matter.

As to the member for Trinity, he has not given his reasons for supporting the amendment advanced by the Hon. the Minister of Public Works so I will not cross swords with him, but I must again express my surprise at the lack of wisdom displayed by the Government in this matter. This movement will come as surely as responsible government came to the Colony, and may as well face the fact that in spite of them the Franchise Bill for women will be placed upon the Statute Book of Newfoundland, and I trust that I shall have the distinction of seeing this come to pass.

MR .TARGETT:—Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks with regard to the Woman's Sufffage Bill.

I intended to congratulate the hon. member for St. John's East, Mr. Fox, after he made his speech, and I can assure the gentleman that he is not more in favour of the Woman's Suffrage Bill than I am. I am very sorry for the assertions which he made. He said that the Government were led by the Hon. the Prime Minister, and I want to tell the hon. gentleman, here and now, that the Premier never mentioned to me in this House how I ought to vote, and I can tell him that it would be just as well for the Premier, or anybody else to snap his fingers at me as to tell me how to vote. I am not married to the Premier, I always use the dictates of my own conscience, while at the same time I always like to get information from other people. But I wish to say that I am in favor of the Suffrage for Women and I am going to vote accordingly. I do not know whether it is going to be passed this year or next, but, as I said before, no member ever hinted to me as to what he was or was not going to do in the matter, and I am very sorry that the hon. member for St. John's East made such an assertion here to-day as far as I am personally concerned. I do not know the reason why the Minister of Public Works spoke the way he did on this matter. He certainly never spoke a word to me about it, nor did the ladies of Trinity district ever speak a word to me about it, nor do I want them to do so. I repeat that I am prepared to vote for the measure when it comes before this House of Assembly again.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill it follows almost as a natural consequence the petition by the women of Newfoundland claiming the franchise. The bill needs very little introduction to the members, but I would ask that the bill be regarded not from the standpoint of courtesy or sentimentality, but in the cold calculated light as seen by other countries of the world. The bill is intended to give to the women of Nfld. the right of suffrage as full as that enjoyed by the men. For that purpose this bill is intended to amend the Election Act by striking out section 3 subsection (a) of the chapter and substituting therefor "The express 'person' means any person, male or female." Then sec. 4 is amended by inserting on the first line of the section after the word "male" and before the words "British Subject the words "or female." The other change is that in the whole Act unless the context otherwise requires, words importing the masculine gender shall be held to include the feminine gender and vice versa.

These changes will I feel sure get recognition and acceptance by all the members of the Assembly. I feel sure that every honorable member is conversant with modern constitutional enactments on this subject. I regard it as nothing more than a recognition of the right. It is a right that has been granted to women of other countries, and Newfoundland women ask that they be put on the same level as these women. In New Zealand the measure met with ready acceptance. Australia quickly came to the forefront. Canada, during the war, followed in a similar course. America followed suit. And England will have untold benefit as a result of the adoption of the measure. I have never heard a valid argument against conferring upon women this function. We have been approached without any militant spirit, without any vindictiveness. When we regard the place that women held in Newfoundland to-day, when we regard the part played by them during the war, when we see our banks and offices staffed by women, when we see the social, religious and moral benefit,—when we see that Newfoundland is benefiting by all these advantages how can we have

the impudence and arrogance not to grant it.

Ido not think that we should regard the granting of this function as a matter of courtesy. I look at it as a matter of duty and necessity, something that should be granted as by right, and that strengthens their position to-day. When they come along and ask us to direct our attention to the merits of the proposed measure, and we view it from the point that it is going to confer upon the country the benefit of their service, I cannot conceive of a single argument against it.

HON. MINISTER PUBLIC WORKS:—Mr. Speaker, I don't want it to be understood that I am opposed to the principle of this Bill but I don't think it is quite fair to have it sprung upon us at such short notice. Women suffrage is at present confined to St. John's and nothing has been received from the outports. Mr. Speaker I wish to propose an amendment that this Bill be read a second time six months from today.

MR. MOORE:—I must congratulate the Government for the stand they have taken in this matter but perhaps they have not considered the great part the women of Newfoundland have played in the war and I don't see why the Government should throw down this Bill. Mr. Fox's speech on behalf of the women of this country will go down in history.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to take part in this discussion but as the introducer of the Bill has seen fit to adopt a recriminating attitude towards the matter from ulterior motives I on behalf of every member on this side of the House desire to say that this is not a party measure or a political matter. In the first place the introducer has seen fit to attack certain members on this side of the House. He has no right to talk about my attitude with regard to any Bill until he hears me say what my attitude is but when he got up to speak he did not know what my ideas were.

MR. FOX:—You told me what you thought of the Bill.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—What were my words?

MR. FOX:—It is not necessary to tell you the exact words.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I hav not been opposed to the Women's Suffrage. I have been told in the street and in my office that it is reported I am. Now I disclaim it and go further and say that a Women's Deputation asked me to introduce this Bill and I pledged myself that I would do so next year but not this year and I also pledged some members on this side of the House. The honourable member had no right whatever to get up here and talk as he did about those who did not see eye to eye with him with regard to this Bill and call them one mass of hypocrisy. I was not hypocrtical about being in favour of it but pledged myself to bring in the Bill next year and I gave a guarantee of my good faith. The honourable member refers to this as a matter of grave importance. It is a matter of grave importance and I would ask the honourable member why he has been so wanton in the language and the attack he has used and made. It is a matter of grave importance and that is why it should not be sprung on this House without a moment's notice to ninety-eight per cent of the electors of this Island. I have ten thousand constituents in the district of Fortune Bay and they have not heard one word on this matter and now we are in a hurry to get this Bill introduced. The honourable member is trying to take political advantage of the measure.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, it is to me a matter of extreme regret that the honourable member for St. John's East, Mr. Fox, has in a bitter, partisan speech, at-

tempted to make this measure a political football. A matter of this sort should not be a Party measure, and it is unfair to the cause which the honourable member claims to represent that he should destroy this Bill by making it a Party measure. I do not think there is one Government member within the hearing of my voice who is opposed to the general principle of Woman Suffrage. The observations of Mr. Fox concerning the two honourable and gallant gentlemen, Lieut. Small and Sergeant Major LeGrow, are entirely uncalled for and without any foundation in fact. His observations were grossly discourteous to these gentlemen. I was astounded when I heard Mr. Fox refer to my distinguished friend and political associate, Sergeant Major LeGrow, as a coward who, at the crack of the Party whip, ran away and would not face a debate on this measure. Mr. LeGrow at the present time is campaigning in the electoral district of Bay de Verde, his own constituency. He is the sitting member for that constituency. There is, as Mr. Fox knows, one seat vacant. Mr. Cave, the Minister of Shipping, is the candidate for that constituency, and Mr. LeGrow is doing his duty by himself and his constiuency, by his Party and by this House, by being in his place in the political battle-line in support of his colleague, Mr. Cave. Lieut. Small is out of town. Mr. Fox has had this Bill on the Order Paper for some days. It has been deferred from day to day. Mr. Small had no notice that on this particular afternoon the Bill would be brought forward for discussion. I would point out to this House that the two honourable and gallant gentlemen who have been insulted and abused by Mr. Fox, the member for St. John's East, are two of Newfoundland's Blue Puttee Boys, two of the first five hundred volunteers who went to fight Mr. Fox's battles when Mr. Fox was not able to go and fight for himself. Mr. Fox has used contemptible, mean, dirty, false and grossly insulting observations towards these two gallant gentlemen.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point or order.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—State your point.

MR. FOX:—Will the Prime Minister take his seat first and then I will?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I will.

MR. FOX:—I ask the Prime Minister to kindly repeat the words I used in reference to these hon. gentlemen. I placed them in the one category with the rest of the Government.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—The stenographer will repeat what you said.

MR. FOX:—The stenographer will not, sir. I had an evidence of that sort of thing before and I have another evidence of it this afternoon. What I said was, that a few short weeks ago these two gentlemen had the privilege of supporting proposals coming from the women of Newfoundland, and that these two gentlemen are absent from this House now when it is their duty as supporters of that movement to be here.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—That is not what you said. You said they were a mass of hypocrisy.

MR. FOX:—I did not. I said the Government as a whole was a mass of hypocrisy, without singling out in any way any individual member of the Government.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—You said that they stayed away deliberately.

MR. FOX:—I did not say that they stayed away deliberately. (I asked did they stay away deliberately.) Why does the Hon. Minister of Justice support the position of the Prime Minister

and knowingly foist such a charge upon me.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I would ask the hon. member for St. John's East if he did not say that these two gentlemen stayed away because they were told.

MR. FOX:—I never said any such thing.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—The hon. member for St. John's East said that these two gentlemen were a mass of hypocrisy. He has denied having said it, well then there is nothing more for us to say. He has risen to a point of order. I wish he would state his point and then sit down.

MR. FOX:—Unless you correct my words you have no right to get up here and make a charge against me. I say that the Prime Minister is wrong. He inadvertently took down what I said an dwrongly applied the words I used. I said that the Government, by their attitude, were a mass of hypocrisy. Would the Hon. Minister of Justice, for instance, think that I said he was a mass of hypocrisy. When you make such a charge you know that funamentally it is wrong and deliberately framed up to put a misconstruction on my words.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—If my honourable friend has completed his somewhat lengthy observations on his point of order, I would like to be permitted to continue my remarks referring to the discourteous words by Mr. Fox with respect to Messrs. Small and LeGrow. I would first point out that when Mr. Fox asked me to repeat his words I referred him to the official stenographer, and suggested that the official stenographer would supply the House with his remarks. Mr. Fox replied in a manner which shows the sort of man he is. He said that the stenographer would not repeat it, that he had evidence of that sort of thing before and ha sanother evidence of it this afternoon. What does the honourable member mean? What this House has had an evidence of this afternoon and what this House has had an evidence of before from Mr. Fox is a species of ignorant discourtesy. Mr. Fox stated in the hearing of every member of this House that Messrs. Small and LeGrow had deliberately absented themselves from this House this afternoon. He now indicates his contemptible meanness by saying that he did not make that statement in the form of a positive assertion, but that he asked, did they stay away? I cannot find words in which to express my disgust for any member of the House who would attack these two honourable and gallant gentlemen and charge them with cowardice. Mr. Fox stated that these men, in response to a Party whip, had absented themselves from the House,—or perhaps Mr. Fox will now rise to another point of order and say that he again made an interrogative insinuation. This is not the place and Mr. Fox is not the man to make discourteous insinuations of this sort towards men of the Small and LeGrow type. I also denounce the discourtesy of this city representative towards Mr. Jennings, the Minister of Public Works, one o fthe representatives for the outport constituency of Twillingate, and the discourtesy towards Mr. Guppy, one of the representatives for the outport constituency of Trinity. I would point out to the honourable member and to the House that Mr. Jennings and Mr. Guppy have as much right to express their opinion and to make and second a motion and cast a vote in the House as Mr. Cyril James Fox. Mr. Fox has suggested that the two soldier representatives who are absent from the House asked Mr. Jennings and Mr. Guppy to oppose the Bill introduced by Mr. Fox. That statement is not true. So far as I am aware, Mr. Jennings was not asked by any person, nor, so

far as I am aware, was Mr. Guppy asked by any person to do so. The member for St. John's East is laboring under an entire misapprehension of the personal views of the individual members of the Government. I regret exceedingly that a junior member of this House, who has perhaps used more words and offered less wisdom than any other member of the House during the past few weeks this Legislature has been in session, should have felt it a part of the duty which he owes to his city constituency to insult two Great War veterans and two independent outport representatives. Not one of these four gentlemen may have had the opportunity of the classical education of the member for St. John's East. They certainly speak in much simpler and more intelligible English than he does. But because none of them may have had the privilege of being born in the city and the leisure to memorize Macaulay, they should not be the subject of sneers and contempt at the hands of Mr. Fox. While Mr. Fox was at leisure, pursuing his studies, Messrs. Small and LeGrow were risking their lives that he may live and study in peace. While Mr. Jennings and Mr. Guppy were battling with the storms of the rugged coasts of our Colony, engaged in the successful pursuit of Newfoundland's staple industry, the fisheries, Mr. Fox was enjoying the repose of the leisurely armchair and the luxury of the classics. Men are made by struggle rather than by leisure and processes of so called refinement. Gentlemanliness is inborn rather than an appendage acquired by study in the same way as an accent. It is very unfortunate that the women who are behind this Bill should have selected as the person whom they desired to make responsible for its passage through this House one who should see fit to be discourteous, insulting and offensive to his betters, two of whom are to-day absent from the House.

The principle of Woman Suffrage has been adopted by the leading nations of the world. At various stages of the development of civilization and in various countries women have been the slaves, the equals and the masters of men, and perhaps in every country, in every age, there have been women who in the same generation have been the slaves ,the equals and the masters of men. The recent War gave women an opportunity to show their strength and nobly have they borne their share of the world's work and the world's sacrifice. The principle of Woman Suffrage in Newfoundland is embodied in the Municipal Charter, which Bill, I am informed, will be introduced into this Chamber during the present session. Women in various parts of the world have taken rank in commercial and professional life on an equality with men. In social life they have long been men's superiors and leaders. There are some avocations in which men cannot possibly compete with women, as there are others in which women cannot possibly compete with men. The years of war have developed between the sexes a mutual appreciation, and the mingling of the sexes in commercial, professional and mechanical pursuits has developed a spirit of cameradie good-fellowship and mutual regard which is exceedingly helpful in the conduct of life's affairs. I feel, as Mr. Jennings and other members of my Party feel, that this House should have an opportunity of studying and debating this matter of woman suffrage in its application to Newfoundland conditions. I feel that this Chamber should have an opportunity of making itself acquainted with similar proposals elsewhere, particularly in Great Britain and the Sister Dominions, and that Newfoundland should follow the Mother Country in this regard as closely as

local conditions render practicable. The effect of this motion is merely to defer the consideration of the measure. The representatives of the various constituencies, particularly outport constituencies, have had no opportunity whatever of making themselves acquainted, even in the most casual way, with the views of their constituencies in this regard, and I fully sympathise with Mr. Jennings, the representative for the District of Twillingate, and Mr. Guppy, the representative for the District of Trinity, when they point out to the House that this measure, which to them is absolutely new, a measure which is entirely new to their constituents, a matter to which they have given absolutely no thought, should not be rushed through without their having an opportunity of making themselves acquainted with the scope and effect of similar legislation elsewhere, the effect of its operation in other countries, and the views of their constituents in that regard.

MR. FOX:—I may say in reply to the honourable member with regard to his statement that the Government has desired that this matter be deferred that a Cabinet Minister informed me that the Government intended to give this matter a six months' hoist.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word or two with regard to this matter. Like some of the previous speakers, I had no intention o ftaking any part whatever in the discussion, but having heard the debate, I think it is my duty to place myself on record as having voiced my opinion on the measure now before the House. I think it is a pity that the discussion should have taken the trend it has this evening, and I feel sure that if the ladies who have listened to it were to go out and report what they have heard, a great many of those who have supported the movement would withdraw their request that the franchise be extended to them, for if this is the first gun in the women's campaign for the privilege of the ballot, I can only say that it has been fired under extremely unfortunate circumstances. With the remarks of the Hon. Minister of Justice I disagree entirely because he has pledged himself to support the Bill at the next session.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I said I woul dintroduce it then.

MR. WALSH:—And the reason he gave for not supporting it now was that he had heard nothing from his district with regard to it, and did not know what the attitude of his constituents towards the measure would be. In this the hon. gentleman is altogether inconsistent because it might well happen that on consulting his constituents he would find that 95 per cent of them were opposed to Woman Suffrage, and in that event where would his pledge of support for the measure at the next session come in? I am going to oppose the amendment that the Bill be read a second time six months from now because I consider it nonsensical to put it off for another year. Let us be big enough and honest enough to bring the Bill into Committee and if it is to be defeated, let it be defeated in the regula rway. What right has anyone to dictate to me or any other man what he should or should not do? An election might be held in six months from now and by deferring this bill to the next session we would be disfranchising the women of the country who are now asking for the vote. I saw for the first time to-day a telegram sent in from one of the larger settlements of the district I represent, signed by a large number of the women, asking that this right be granted to the women of Newfoundland, and I have no doubt that were the thing to be fully ventilated, the petitions would be largely signed. What my attitude

will be should the bill go into committee I shall not state, but I oppose the amendment to give it a six months hoist.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—Mr. Speaker, I hold the opinion that no government has the right to legislate on a matter of such importance as this without first having obtained the opinion of the country with regard to it. If a petition signed by two thousand women of St. John's is presented to this House asking for woman suffrage, is that any reason why we should immediately pass the measure without having due regard to the wishes or views of the people of the other districts all over the country? If the matter is to be decided on the merits of the petitions presented, then we certainly have no grounds in that direction for any legislation at present. I repeat that I haven't received a single request from the women of my district to support a measure of this kind and if my hon. friend, the introducer of the bill has been more fortunate in that respect with regard to his constituency, I cannot be expected to fall in with his views on that account but I give him this challenge that I will stand against him in the District of Twillingate when the women have the vote, and I will not be afraid of the results. I'll go further than that and I'll say that I was in favor of Woman Suffrage before the hon. member for St. John's West was in his political swaddling clothes and I don't think the hon. gentleman had any right to act as he did this afternoon because others could not see eye to eye with him on this matter. I want to say in conclusion sir, that when the Bill is brought before the House in the right manner and at the proper time, and after the Government has had an opportunity of obtaining more fully a knowledge of the wishes of the country at large, I shall be prepared to give it my hearty support.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Mr. Speaker, I have heard nothing in this debate that leads me to alter the opinion I had before I came in here this evening, but I must congratulate the women of St. John's on their choice of a champion. Mr. Fox has put forward the claims of the women as perhaps no other member of this House could have done and he has advanced arguments in support of their claims which are certainly irrefutable. I see no reason why the women of Newfoundland should have a vote but I am not prepared to support this Bill before I have the endorsation of my constituents in doing so. If the women of Placentia and St. Mary's want the vote it would only have been a matter of courtesy for them to place their demands before this House in the form of petitions. I have seen one telegram from the District of Placentia and St. Mary's with some twenty names signed to it, and the member for St. John's East has told us that he has innumerable signatures from other quarters, but with the exception of the petitions from the women of St. John's and that from Grand Falls, I doubt if there are one hundred bona fide signatures in from other parts of the country. The hon. member for St. John's East has told us to approach this question without bias or without prejudice and I am approaching it without either and I say that in my opinion there is no need for the great rush which is now being manifested to put this far-reaching measure into effect at this late session of the House, more especially as I understand the movers in this matter have received an assurance from the Government that they were prepared to carry this measure through at the next session of Parliament.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until

to-morrow Friday at three of the clock in the afternoon.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, June 11th, 1920.

The House met pursuant to adjournment.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, since taking my seat here this afternoon, I received the following letter from Mr. John J. St. John, Secretary of the Moderate Prohibition Committee:

"St. John's, Nfld.,
"May 17th, 1920.

"Hon. R. A. Squires, K.C., M.H.A.,
"Prime Minister.

"Dear Sir:

"I am instructed by the Moderate "Prohibition Committee to hand you "herewith several petitions from the "electors of St. John's West on the "Question of a modification of the pre-"sent Prohibition Act now in force, "with the request that you, as senior "member for the district will kindly "present these petitions to the House "at the earliest opportunity.

"Respectfully yours,
JOHN J. ST. JOHN,
"Secretary of Committee."

In accordance with the request of the Secretary of the Committee I present petitions Nos. 7, 30, 34, 57, 61, 117.

MR. MacDONNELL:—I ask leave to present three petitions from St. George's, asking for a modification of the Prohibition Act. This makes eleven hundred signatures from St. George's in favour of a modification of the present Act. In presenting these petitions, I would suggest, that an account of the signatures be taken by the Colonial Secretary's Department in order that we may get the facts later on as to the number who have signed petitions.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, with regard to the petitions presented by the member for St. George's, Mr. MacDonnell, asking for a modification of the Prohibition Law, I would observe that the Government has had under consideration numerous and largely signed petitions relating to Prohibition. There have been a large number of petitions asking for a modification of the Act; there have been a smaller number of petitions asking that the present Act be not modified and that it be strictly enforced. The Government has given this matter careful consideration and has decided to appoint a Commission which will be representative of all shades of thought in connection with this matter of the use of intoxicating liquors and the application to Newfoundland of legislation to control its misuse. The duty of the Commission will be to inquire into the operation of Prohibition legislation in Canada and the United States, and the Continent of Europe, inquire into Newfoundland conditions, the use of dope, moonshining, smuggling, and having thoroughly considered the legislation of the world in this regard, in the light of local conditions to make recommendations to the Government upon the basis of which such a Legislative enactment as may be necessary in the premises shall be introduced at the next session of the Legislature.

MR. MacDONNELL:—Will we get a report from the Commission this session?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—No report can possibly be received from that Commission this session. It will take many months of serious study and careful consideration.

MR. MacDONNELL:—In that case it will be no use to appoint a Commission because the question will be settled one way or another before that. Petitions from seven thousand people got a plebiscite for Prohibition, and

now when there are fifteen thousand people petitioning for modification all we hear is that a Commission will be appointed to inquire into the matter sometime, and it will report sometime. That is not satisfactory and I believe that some member will bring in a bill in favor of moderation before this House closes.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—I would like to point out to the Hon. the Prime Minister that in the District of Ferryland fires are burning in all directions, and nobody in the Government has taken any notice of that district. I asked to have someone sent out there to make a report on the matter to the Agriculture Department. The fire has been burning near Renews for the last ten days, and the only timber on the Southern Shore, which is at LeManche, has been destroyed, and the fire is sweeping in all directions. I brought this matter to the attention of the Leader of the Government. He don't seem to take any interest in the matter.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition mentioned that matter to me, and on the next occasion when I met Dr. Campbell I spoke to him about it, and he told me that he had received a message asking that a warden be appointed, and that he had made arrangements for that appointment.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—He may have said that, but the bridge erected at Acquaforte by some unknown person by the Hon. Minister of Public Works has been destroyed. I received a note from the Deputy Minister of the Department of Agriculture and Mines, saying that a Mr. Dinning had been appointed as warden, a man who if he went near a fire should have a bodyguard to protect him as he is well past his labour.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Speaker, might I be permitted to ask the Hon. the Leader of the Government, in view of the alarming proportions assumed by the forest fires whether the Government has given any thought to making arrangements for protection against town fire. My reason for asking is that to-day the fire has got down on Cove Road, which is very near town. I think that the Government would have the endorsation and support of the House and the city in taking some unusual steps to provide against the possibility of an outbreak in town.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—In reply to the honourable member for St. John's East I have to say that Dr. Alexander Campbell, the Minister of Agriculture and Mines, is himself personally in charge of fire fighting operations in that section of the country from Brigus Junction to Port Blandford, where a fierce forest fire is now raging. A large number of men have been engaged for the work of fire fighting in that section. The Reid Newfoundland Company has been approached by Dr. Campbell in the matter of the employment of the Reid section men as fire fighters. So far as the protection of the suburbs of St. John's is concerned, that matter is in charge of Mr. George Turner, the Deputy Minister of Agriculture and Mines, who, I am informed, leaves this afternoon supervising fire fighting operations in one of the outlying sections of the District of St. John's East. The Inspector General of Constabulary, who is head of the Fire Department, has special instructions in this matter also. The honourable member and the residents of the District of St. John's East and St. John's West may feel confident that every effort which human thought and energy can devise is being directed to the prevention of devastation by forest fires.

Committee of the Whole on Bill entitled "An Act to Amend 'The Society for the Protection of Animals Act, 1914."

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Chairman, might I ask what is there in the Bill to prevent the owner from buying in the animal again.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Chairman, yes, I would move the following addition as an amendment:

"That it shall not be lawful for said "defendant to purchase said animal at "such sale, or thereafter to hold said "animal."

Second reading of a Bill respecting Elections in the Present Year.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Speaker, yesterday at the request of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition the second reading of this Bill was deferred until to-day, and the Hon. Leader of the Government appeared to think then that the request for deferring the second reading was due to some malign purpose or some desire on the part of those who requested that deferring to unduly delay its passage. I think I intimated to him yesterday that there was no such desire, but simply a wish to get a clear understanding of what the Bill really covered, and, having read the Bill and having given thought to it, I think, perhaps, it would be unnecessary on this occasion that I should give voice in congratulating the Government for the manner in which the Bill is framed. I can quite conceive the idea which the Bill is intended to accomplish and quite appreciate the object that was in mind when the Bill was drafted, and I trust that the Bill will meet the objects the Government have in mind for presenting it in its present form. Therefore, so far as I am concerned, at this stage I merely desire to oppose the second reading of the Bill for the reason that I intimated yesterday and for the reason that the excuse given for the presentation of this Bill, that it ought to go through this House pro forma and that it was but a re-enacting of what was done last year, does not hold water. I stated then and I repeat now that there is absolutely no similarity in the two cases at all. The Act of 1919 was an Act brought into being for the purpose of making good the election lists that had been taken about a year and a half previous to the holding of the elections last November. The law, as it stood in 1913, under the Election Act of that year, was such that the lists were good for only twelve months, and that period having elapsed and the necessity for a General Election being imminent, legislation for the taking of the new lists was necessary. But there is at once this difference between the two cases. In the first case the House was providing for an election throughout the entire country, an election, which, I think, it will not be denied, was necessary, apart altogether from the length of time that had intervened between the last general election and the previous one but more particularly because of the fact that the House was so short of its membership, so many had gone away and so many had died, that the calling of a general election to fill the vacancies in the House was an absolute necessity, as there were no representatives at all for some districts. But the situation that we are asked to have confirmed to-day, and the great rush that has been made to get this Bill before the House, does not contain any such condition at all. This Bill is formally and merely brought before the House and we are asked to make it law, under its own words in the sense of the last section of it, as applying in particular to the election in Bay de Verde district. The last section provides that any list of electors taken up to the date of the election will be sufficient for the purpose of any election during the year 1920 of members of the House of Assembly for such district, and this at the present time, according to a Gazette Extraordinary, the Government is arranging to have done,

and, as I gathered from the remarks of the Prime Minister yesterday, such a list is being taken now for Bay de Verde. Then the idea is to rush through with the taking of this list in order to make the election valid, pending the 24th instant. Time will tell the wisdom of this Bill and time will disclose how far the Government will have cause to congratulate itself upon the Bill, and time will, more than all others things, justify the position that I purpose to take in objecting to the Bill, because the Bill is one in which the accepted principle, which has been handed down for years, is flagrantly violated, where there is no occasion for it. Bay de Verde is represented. Bay de Verde has at present one member in this House. Bay de Verde had two members in this House up to two days ago. And that district is now being made the excuse of this Bill in order that it may afford an opportunity for the Government to justify the appointment of the late Minister of Shipping the position which the Government itself through its leader told the country was of more or less temporary duration. This is a position which was provided for by a special section in the Bill dealing with Legislative Disabilities and which section became unnecessary and was cut out by the Upper House when the Supreme Court invalidated the election. This position has reached a rather humorous aspect and it is with extraordinary haste the Government has tried to secure the unfortunate situation when they commit themselves to a Bill like this which time only will be able to justify as to its wisdom, justify whether the Govt. has accomplished its purpose and time will justify our opposition to it. The election in Bay de Verde has been rushed unduly for reasons that are obvious. It is unduly rushed because it was thought that the late member for that district, Mr. Hickman, would be a likely candidate for the district if conditions were normal, fair and proper and the election were held I submit in due time and due season and the Gazette was issued because also another gentleman of much influence might be out of the district. As to the wisdom of the Government in this matter, that aspect will be more or less dealt with by the people immediately interested and the aspects of our objection may be discussed on a future day when the election is over. There has been reference to the explanation as to why the election was called and why it was justified. Well, before the House closes maybe there be an opportunity to deal with this and I may intimate that these intimations have not passed unnoticed and that the ideas behind the matter were not unobserved and I hope the time will come when we shall have an opportunity to discuss this in this house which is the proper place to do so. I fear that this is an occasion, and I may be pardoned for being a prophet, on which I must prophesy that those who are responsible for the Bill may find that the Bill does not quite fit in so as to accomplish what was intended and perhaps they may find that despite the undue haste they have displayed and the feverish anxiety they have shown to have a nominee of theirs to come back to this House that ere long they may discover that in accordance with the old story to "always make haste slowly" that the Government has hastened a little too quickly and because I have sympathy for that feverish anxiety that causes that haste and because I appreciate the awkward position in which some of the members of the Government find themselves and because I realise that some of them labour under an aspect denuded of support that I quite forgive them as far as I am personally concerned for the extraordinary way in which this

House called this election at a season of the year when hundreds of men have gone away from the district and it is therefore deprived considerably of its voting strength.

Mr. Fox gives notice of introduction of Bill.

Mr. Walsh gives notice of questions.

Sir Michael Cashin gives notice of question.

The House then adjourned.

MONDAY, June 14th, 1920.

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

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present petitions, containing the signatures of a thousand voters in Ferryland District, asking for a modification of the Prohibition Act. I have much pleasure in supporting the prayer of the petitioners.

MR. MOORE:—Mr. Speaker, I heartily support the prayer of those thousand petitioners and I hope that their request will be granted.

Sir M. P. Cashin gave notice of question.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Sir M. F. Cashin the Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 143 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Keeping of Dogs'" was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—In the absence of the Hon. the Prime Minister, I beg to state that the Sudbury property had been purchased by the Government upon the representation of the Hospitals and Pensions Boards for the use of returned soldiers.

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 authorize the Montreal Trust Co., to do business in the Colony of Newfoundland; and "An Act further to amend Chapter 35 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Postal and Telegraph Services'" without amendment.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Mr. Fox the Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 108 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Protection of Animals'" 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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. the Minister of Justice the House resolved itself into a Committee of the whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to amend 9 and 10 Geo. V Cap XV Electins in the Present Year."

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Samson took the chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Chairman, section (5) as it reads at present may mean practically any list whatever, so I would move, as an amendment, the addition of the words "up to the 1st of June, 1920, and before the date appointed for an election."

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had passed the Bill with some amendment.

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

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions respecting certain concessions to

the Dominion Cooperative Buliding Association Ltd.

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to confirm a contract made by the Government with the Terra Nova Sulphite Co., Ltd.

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

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, June 15th, 1920.

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

MR. BENNETT:—Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the member for Port de Grave, Sir John Crosbie, I beg to present a petition from that district asking for a modification of the Prohibition Act. This petition is in similar form as others formerly presented on this subject and is very largely signed by the residents of this district. I, therefore, desire to lay it upon the table of the House and to ask that it be given consideration.

Committee of the Whole on Supply.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—Mr. Chairman, following the usual proceedings each hon. member will find on his desk a copy of the Estimates for the coming fiscal year. The increases this year will seem very large but they are represented by changes, every one of which I think will appeal to every hon. member of this House. These changes, whilst brought down by the present Government, are not altogether our work, but to a large extent, we are finalizing the intentions of our predecessors, as it will be remembered that the late Government appointed a special Commission to deal with the salaries of all officials and we are therefore adopting their report. It is my intention to deal with the Estimates as summarized and explain the increases under different heads. The first item, Interest on Public Debt, will show an increase of $112,988. This increase is due to exchange principally, and if exchange becomes normal again our liabilities under this Head will decrease; Head two will show an increase of $289,643; Head three $14,834; Head four $69,-364; Head five $40,982; Head six $287,659; Head seven $211,829; eight $24,917; nine $58,600; ten $139,577; eleven $23,892; twelve $395,732; thirteen, Customs, $211,684; fourteen $40,000; fifteen $47,300; seventeen, decrease of———

If there is any additional information desired by hon. gentlemen, I shall be glad to furnish same as we proceed with the details. I would move that the Committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again on to-morrow.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—I would ask that the Estimates be deferred until Thursday, to give us time to consider them.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—Alright, Thursday.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—Mr. Speaker, in rising to make the financial statement, which by long Parliamentary usage is designated the Budget Speech, I appeal to you, Sir, and to the Honourable members of this House for that consideration due to one to whom for the first time, and without previous experience, has been allotted a task as onerous and responsible as any that can be undertaken by a Minister of the Crown in our local Legislature.

I cannot be expected during the short time I have had the honour to occupy the position of Minister of Finance and

Customs, to have absorbed that intimate knowledge of the financial affairs of the Dominion which can be attained only after years of experience, or to have acquired that grasp of details of the Country's trade, commerce and industries which only long association with the statistical departments of the Government can bring.

I shall not at this stage make any observations on the fiscal policy of the late Government but I deem it necessary to comment somewhat on certain phases thereof before concluding my remarks on the financial and industrial situation which now commands the attention of this House.

I shall therefore without further preliminary remarks proceed to the important task I have in hand which is to lay before the House an accurate and complete statement of the Dominion's present financial position, covering both income and expenditure, and submit for the consideration of Honourable members the Government's proposals for raising supply to be granted to His Majesty and outline the resources which we may confidently rely on for the forthcoming year, as well as the expenses we may have to incur in the administration of Government. This I shall endeavour to do in a straightforward manner and as expeditiously as the importance of the subject permits.

The fiscal year ending June 30th, 1919, produced the largest revenue in the history of the Country.

The total Revenue collected from all sources was $9,535,755.16, showing an increase over that of the previous year of $2,810,493.85.

To that total the Customs Revenue contributed the sum of $7,191,260, being an increase of $2,267,864 over the receipts from the same source the previous year, which increase is shown by the following comparative statement:—

	1918	1919	Increase 1919
Customs	$4,923,396.31	$7,191,260.71	$2,267,864.40
Other Sources	1,801,835.00	2,344,464.45	542,629.45
	$6,725,231.31	$9,535,725.16	$2,810,493.85

The public accounts already tabled for the fiscal year 1918-19 show total expenditure on ordinary account of the sum of $6,766,430.51 as compared with an expenditure of $5,554,603.37 for the corresponding period 1917-18, an increase in civil expenditure for the past year of $1,211,827.14.

The heads under which the principal increases occurred were the following:

Head	Increase	Decrease
1, Interest on Public Debt	$ 461,381.17	
2, Civil Government	119,443.95	
3, Pensions	1,002.89	
4, Administration of Justice	65,648.86	
5, Legislation		$ 4,341.15
6, Education	99,547.83	
7, Public Charities	114,368.33	
8, Lighthouses	37,869.54	
9, Agriculture and Mines	2,311.76	
10, Marine and Fisheries	45,731.92	
11, Roads, Bridges and Ferries	11,223.82	

12, Postal Telegraphs	277,030.59	
13, Customs	141,302.00	
14, General Contingencies		65,494.16
15, Elections		14,902.26
Surplus Trust		131,821.71
	$1,428,386.42	$216,559.28
	216,559.28	
	$1,211,827.14	

Under the head of Interest on Public Debt is embraced interest on our war borrowings.

The outcome of the financial transactions of the past year may be summarised as follows,—

Revenue from all sources	$$9,535,725.16
Ordinary Expenditure	6,766,430.51
Showing a surplus for the fiscal year 1918-1919 of	$2,769,294.65

Turning now, Mr. Speaker, to the current year ending June 30th next I find that from present indications the total revenue from all sources will exceed the estimates submitted in the Budget last session. I base this calculation on the actual Revenue for the nine months, accounts of which are available, and on the average Revenue annually received for the remaining three months.

From the beginning of the present fiscal year t othe end of March the total Revenue from all sources amounted to $6,881,555.89 showing an increase of $1,361,063.58 over the same period of the preceeding year. Of this sum $6,031,507.25 was derived from Customs Revenue an increase under this head of $1,342,972.39 over that of the same period the previous year.

For the remaining three months of the current fiscal year, April, May, and June, I estimate $4,500,000.00 from all sources, which will bring the Revenue for the fiscal year ending June 30th next up to roundly $11,400,000.00. The Expenditure for the current year I estimate $10,800,000.00, leaving a balance in favor of the Colony of $800 000.00.

I have thus far reviewed the financial transactions of the past year as exhibited in the public accounts, and the situation of our finances for the present year as far as statistics available permit.

I now, Mr. Speaker, come to the consideration of the third and last of the financial periods which come within the scope of an annual Budget Speech, that is the fiscal year upon which we shall enter on July 1st next, and which ends on June 30th, 1921.

I shall first deal with expenditure. So far as we can at present estimate, our civil expenditure for the fiscal year 1920-21 will amount to about $10,-250,000.00, as compared with roundly $9,145,554.00 for the present year.

The above estimated ordinary expenditure for the year ending June 30th, 1921, is based on the fixed charges of civil Government which permit of fairly close estimate. To that amount we must add Expenditure arising from war obligations, such as provision for disabled sailors, soldiers, vocational training, maintenance of Militia Department, and winding up of our Military undertakings, and charges incidental thereto which properly ought to be placed under the head of extraordinary

charges, as such disbursements cannot rightly come under any department of civil Government and cannot be classified as ordinary expenditures.

The amount required to meet these last named obligations I estimate at roundly $750,000.00. This gives us an estimated total expenditure for the coming year of approximately $11,000,000.00.

To meet this expenditure we propose to re-enact last year's revenue Bill, with some amendments which I shall refer to further on.

I estimate the Revenue for next year as follows,—

Customs.. .. ..$	8,700,000.00
Posts and Telegraphs..	540,000.00
Crown Lands..	150,000.00
Fines and Forfeitures..	8,000.00
Stamps...	60,000.00
Penitentiary Broom Dpt.	35,000.00
Taxes and Assessments	55,000.00
Liquor Control..	200,000.00
Excess Profits' Tax. ..	800,000.00
Income Tax..	50,000.00
Fees on Public Institutions...	6,000.00
Interest on Municipal Council Debt..	57,000.00
Miscellaneous...	450,000.00
	$11,201,000.00

The expenditure on account of civil Government having materially changed since last year's estimates were submitted necessitated revision which will be readily noticed on reference thereto. This revision was made necessary and is based upon the report of the Civil Service Commission to whom was entrusted by our predecessors the duty of standardizing the salaries of civil servants.

In view of the world-wide depression and unrest now existing it may be asked if even in the estimate I have made I am not over-sanguine. I do not hesitate to reply, No. The resources of revenue which for the past few years have been so prolific we anticipate will maintain their productivity without serious abatement during the coming year. Past experience has demonstrated that the greatest fluctuations recorded in our Revenue for a long period did not embarrass the exchequer to any extent.

Nor have I overlooked the fact that the large Revenues of the immediate past were mainly derived from exorbitant prices of imports, the result of abnormal conditions brought about by the war.

All these things, Sir, have received due consideration, and despite the fact that trade, commerce and industries all over the world are in an unsettled state, and that it is not improbable that a reduction in the prices of commodities which form the basis of our Customs Revenue may diminish our receipts somewhat during the coming year, I still confidently anticipate a sufficient revenue from all sources to meet the ordinary expenditures of civil government as outlined in our Estimates. Under these circumstances we feel we are fully justified in removing from the Tariff the undersigned articles and legalising certain modifications made in the Tariff by the late Government.

I propose to make the following alterations in the Tariff, viz,—

To change the duty on rough undressed leathers, when imported by tanners for further dressing from three cents per lb., to 20 cents ad valorem.

To specify under Item 103 "Bologna Sausages" per lb. one cent.

To include on Item 106, under the head of Nails, "Iron or steel Fasteners to be used by box makers" per lb. 3/8 ct.

To return to the free list the following items, viz.,—

Item 159 Agricultural Implements, etc., Item 160, Animals imported by

Agricultural Societies, etc., Item 172, Tanning Extracts, Item 175, Books, etc., Item 196 196, Manures and Fertilizers, etc., Item 204, plants, trees, etc., Item 205, Printing paper, etc., Item 207, Sand, Fire-clay, etc., Item 217, Wheat whole. To legalize the change made in the duty on Indian Corn. Item 191, and Cattle feeds, Item 200, by substituting ten cents per 100 lbs., for ten cents ad valorem. To place on the free list, Apparatus imported for use in fish drying, (Not to include ordinary tools), also receptacles for putting up jams and jellies when imported by manufacturers for from twenty cents to ten cents per cwt. and to strike out from the schedule the Item, "Split Herring."

I shall now, Mr. Speaker, take up the consideration of our Public debt,—

The position of the Dominion in respect to Bonded Indebtedness on the 30th of June, 1919, was as follows,—

Loan at 3 per cent. . . .	$ 1,581,666.66
Loan at 3½ per cent. .	18,905,546.65
Loan at 4 per cent. . . .	9,002,432.29
Loan at 5½ per cent. .	5,000,000.00
Loan at 6½ per cent. .	7,543,400.00
Total.	$42,033,035.60

Adding to this sum the amount of the loan raised last fall after the present Government took office, namely, $1,000,000.00 we find that at the end of the current year, June 30th, 1920, our gross public debt will be $43,033,-035.60.

From this must be deducted the following amounts,—

Accumulated Sinking Fund.	$1,007,587.42
Guaranteed Debt, St. John's Muncipality. . .	1,433,394.22
Harbour Grace Water Co., Stock.	13,700.00
Total.	$2,454,681.64

This exhibit shows the net funded debt of the Dominion at the present time to be $39,578,352.96.

On the 30th of June, 1914, the gross public debt of the Dominion was $30,-450,765. On the 30th of June, 1919, as stated above, it will be $42,033,035.60, showing an increase of $11,582,270.60, in six years, an average of nearly $2,-000,000.00 per year.

To alter schedule E, of the Revenue Act passed in 1918 by altering the duty on fresh fish and fish exported from salt bulk without being spread or dried

A substantial portion of this indebtedness was incurred on war account. The total expenditure under that head from the date our Regiment was organized to the end of the fiscal year 1919 was $11,486,753.60. For the current year the expenses of the Militia Department, including the Civil-Re-Establishment Committee, will aggregate $2,400,000.00. For the same period we estimate the payments on account of Disability, Pensions, of soldiers and sailors will amount to $545,-000.00. The Militia Department estimate of its requirements for the coming year, 1920-21, is $250,000.00, and the Board of Pensions Commissioners' estimate for same period is roughly $500,000.00. The London Pay and Record Office was closed and the Local Office will be closed at the end of 1920.

Here it may be added that the whole of the Dominion's war expenditure has been met by borrowings, and is charged to Capital Account.

A synoptical statement of these expenditures will be found in the extracts given from the Auditor General's Report annexed.

Turning now, Mr. Speaker, from the subject of our finances and the Public Debt I shall refer briefly to the general affairs of the Country.

Our Import and Export Trade during

the war period shows the following results,—

At the end of the fiscal year 1914 our trade showed an adverse balance of $659,188; our Imports being $15,793,726, and Exports $15,134,543. The uncertainty with which business went through immediately following the outbreak of the war in August 1914 was reflected in the result of the succeeding years trade in both imports and exports. In 1914-1915 our imports dropped $3,442,940, and our exports declined in value $1,997,663, but the trade balance was in our favour to the extent of $786,000. The following year trade recovered from the depression caused by the outbreak of the war and the soaring prices of commodities were reflected in the abnormal increases in the value of our Imports and Exports.

The following statement giving the increases and decreases in both export and import trade during the period from 1914 to 1919 inclusive may be of interest to the House,—

Year	Imports	Increase	Decrease	
1914.. ..	$15,193,726		$ 818,639	less than 1913
1915.. ..	12,350,786		3,342,940	
1916.. ..	16,427,336	$ 4,076,550		
1917.. ..	21,318,310	4,890,974		
1918.. ..	26,892,946	5,574,636		
1919.. ..	33,297,184	6,404,238		
Totals..		$20,946,388	$4,661,579	

Net Increase in Import Trade 1914 to 1919, inclusive.. .. .. ..$17,284,819

Year	Exports	Increase		Decrease
1914.. ..	$15,134,543	$ 461,654	(Over 1913)	
1915.. ..	13,136,880			$ 1,997,663
1916.. ..	18,969,493	5,832,613		
1917.. ..	22,381,762	3,412,269		
1918.. ..	30,153,517	7,771,755		
1919.. ..	36,784,616	6,631,099		
Totals..		**$24,109,390**		$ 1,997,663

Net Increase in Export Trade 1914 to 1919, inclusive.. .. .. ..$22,111,727
Net Increase in Import Trade for same period.. 16,284,819

Total Net Increase Dominion's Trade 1914 to 1919.. .. .. ..$38,396,546

The total gross trade of last year, 1919, was.. .. ..$70,081,800
Compared with.. .. .. 57,046,463 in 1918
Showing an increase over preceeding year of.. 13,035,337

The largest gross increase in trade in our history except that of 1918 which showed an increase of $13,346,391, over the previous year.

The following table shows the result of the last six years import and export trade,—

IMPORTS FROM

Year	Britain	Canada	United States	Elsewhere	Total
1913-14...	$3,826,529	$ 4,681,047	$ 5,796,906	$ 889,244	$15,195,726
1914-15...	2,311,945	4,509,827	4,943,752	585,262	12,350,786
1915-16...	2,579,614	5,870,456	7,097,779	879,487	16,427,336
1916-17...	2,620,033	7,412,300	10,233,899	1,052,078	21,318,310
1917-18...	2,248,781	11,107,642	12,244,946	1,291,577	26,892,946
1918-19...	2,399,853	12,777,684	16,569,236	1,550,461	33,297,184

EXPORTS TO

Year	Britain	Canada	United States	Elsewhere	Total
1913-14...	$3,256,445	$ 1,971,809	$1,679,362	$ 8,226,926	$15,134,543
1914-15...	3,196,353	1,394,663	1,537,385	7,008,429	13,130,830
1915-16...	4,582,379	4,582,379	2,540,606	9,824,736	18,969,493
1916-17...	4,836,074	2,042,117	4,047,842	11,455,729	22,381,762
1917-18...	3,822,931	2,750,990	7,110,322	16,449,274	30,153,517
1918-19...	2,500,419	2,428,217	6,411,340	25,444,640	36,784,616

The following comparative statement shows the movement of trade from 1914 to 1919, and the increase or decrease, as the case may be in the value thereof, between Newfoundland and the principal countries to which we export our products and from which we import our requirements,—

EXPORTS.

Country	1914	1919	Increase	Decrease
United Kingdom...	$3,256,446	$ 2,500,419		$ 756,027
Canada...	1,971,809	2,428,217	$ 455,408	
United States...	1,679,362	6,411,340	4,731,978	
Brazil...	3,240,487	5,179,349	1,838,862	
B. W. Indies...	526,331	1,150,780	624,449	
Portugal...	988,930	7,836,328	6,847,398	
Spain...	1,260,649	3,911,967	2,651,318	
Italy...	1,087,858	3,087,492	1,999,634	
Greece...	403,662	2,091,019	1,637,257	
France...	1,997	1,023,933	1,021,936	

IMPORTS.

United Kingdom...	$3,826,529	$ 2,399,853		$1,426,706
Canada...	4,861,047	12,777,684	$ 7,916,637	
United States...	5,796,906	16,569,236	10,792,330	
British W. I...	222,801	930,904	608,113	
Portugal...	19,970	107,920	87,950	
Spain...	113,541	217,503	103,962	

Thus it will be seen that the effect of the war upon our trade with the United Kingdom was a decrease in exports of roundly three-quarters of a million dollars, and a decrease in our imports from the Mother Country of approximately a million and a half dollars. The value of our imports from Great Britain in 1919 was $179,761 less than 1916, and for the same period our exports showed a falling off to the extent of $2,081,960. This unfavorable showing is undoubtedly due, in te main, to disturbed industrial war-time conditions in the Old Land. The revival of trade and its expansion with the United Kingdom is a purpose which I feel sure will appeal to every

member of this House, and any effort toward the attainmenet thereof will receive every encouragemenet and assistance which this Government can give it.

The phenomenal increase in the value of our imports from the neighbouring Dominion and the United States is due, of course, chiefly to the very great increase in the prices of the commodities which we have had to import from those countries. The increase has been mainly in money value, and not in volume of goods, wares and foods stuffs. As shown by the comparative table of values in Imports and Exports given above our imports from Canada increased nearly eight million dollars, and our exports exports increased less than half a million dollars between 1914 and 1919. Similarly with the United States trade. Our exports to that country increased about four and three quarter millions, while our Imports for the same period increased ten and three quarter million dollars.

The increase in the value of our exports to Portugal during the six years under review was almost $7,000,000 practically all of which was fishery products. Against Portugal's $7,836,-238. na ue of our fishery products, our other chief Mediterranean customers took between them only $9,090,478. worth of Newfoundland products, which also was chiefly proceeds of the fisheries.

The total value of fishery products for the fiscal years 1918 and 1919 was as follows:—

1918,.. .. ..$25,547,334
1919,.. 32,792,271

Showing an increase in value of $7,-213,937, in 1919 over that of the preceeding year.

The total quantity exported in 1918 was 1,821,206 quintals of dry codfish, valued at $18,829,560.

The total quantity exported in 1919 was 1,681,770 quintals valued at $24,-316,830.

This shows a decrease in quantity of 139,436 quintals, and an increase in value of $5,487,270.

The Seal Fishery

The seal fishery of 1919 was the poorest on record up to that date, there being only 81,293 seals taken, against 193,448 the previous year, a decrease of 112,155. The gross value of the products of the seal fishery for 1918 was $863,552, and 1919 $278,145, showing a decrease in value of the proceeds of that industry last year of $585,407. But the smallest catch in modern times, perhaps since the systematic prosecution of that fishey began, was that of the present year, 1920, the total catch being 33,985 seals valued at $159,948. This represents a very considerable loss of capital invested in that industry the past season, which is much to be regretted, and the outfitters of the ships have the sympathy of the trade in this unprecedented failure of what has, on the whole, been a fairly remunerative venture in the past. It is a precarious industry at best, and while it is not improbable that the successes of the past may be duplicated, it is significant of the future in store for this industry that the decreasing number of ships engaged therein is going on from year to year without any apparent intention to replace the disappearing units of the once powerful sealing fleet, and the old-time keenness in the prosecution of the voyage is noticeably absent among the mercantile body. The loss to the men who prosecuted the 1920 seal fishery is also to be deplored, and the general trade of the country for the coming year will surely feel the effects of such a poor catch.

The safer avenues of investments in high dividend paying industrials remunerative trade ventures and development entherprises, the returns

from which may be slow but sure, are probably proving more attractive to the members of the mercantile body who heretofore were the chief investors in the sealing industry. It is to be hoped, however, that the coming year will see the sealing industry prosecuted with renewed energy, and that the returns will be as has often proved before, sufficiently remunerative to those who invest their capital to compensate for the losses of the past couple of years.

The Herring Industry

The branch of our fishery next in value to the sealfishery is the herring fishery, the export value of which in 1918 was $2,067,891. Referring to the 1919 pack the Board of Trade Annual Report, dated January, 1920, says:

"The herring fishery the past season (September 1918 to September 1919) has not been very remunerative to the fishermen and a direct loss to outport packers and merchants. Large stocks of spring-split herring are held in the optuorts and in storage in St. John's waiting for buyers. Some dealers still have their whole summer's collection on hand."

After commenting on the demand for our herring in the principal markets, the extent to which the trade was hampered by high freight charges and exchange rates, the Report continues:

"Considerable quantities of Scotch cure herring put up in the fall of 1918 were stored in New York in January and February 1919 unable to find buyers. Some of the herring are still there and selling at a price that will not more than cover the cost of freight and storage and insurance charges in New York **Our Scotch Cure herring had to compete with Pacific Coast herring put up as Scotch Cure. These supplied the American market at a much lower price than our exporters were asking. Newfoundland Scotch Cure Herring received a set-back through shipments going out in bad order."**

The Board of Trade is undoubtedly in a position to be better informed on the catching, curing and marketing of our fishery products than any other public or mercantile body in this country. Its pronouncements are, therefore, official and carry great weight, and should command the attention of fishermen, merchants and Government alike when it deals in its official capacity with matters having a direct application to an important branch of our staple industry. For this reason I have encroached upon the time of the House to quote the above excerpts from the Board of Trade Report on the Herring industry of 1919. It contains statements of fact which may well occupy the attention of his House. The statement that our Scotch Cure Herring, which promised so well at the beginning, received a set-back "through shipments going out in bad order," **carries with it a condemnation of the Government of this country under whose administration inferior and badly cured herring were allowed to go into the best market we had for such an important product of our fishery certified and branded "Scotch Cure," as it is to be assumed they were.** The statement of the Board of Trade has been corroborated on the floors of this House this session by the Hon. Member for Ferryland, the Leader of the Opposition when he described **"Newfoundland Scotch Cure Herring on the market in New York a few months ago as below the standard in quality and size."** In the face of these conditions need we wonder that Pacific Herring catchers can drive our product out of the American market, after bringing their catch across the Continent over 3,000 miles of railway.

This important branch of our fisheries is capable of great developument, the potential wealth of which should

be more extensively availed of, and under the present capable head of the Marine and Fisheries, with the co-operation of a business administration, an earnest effort will be made to prevent a recurrence of last year's conditions in the New York market.

The Lobster Fishery

The Lobster Fishery of 1919 produced 4,494 cases, against 8,279 the previous year, a falling off in the number of cases to the extent of 3,785. But the advance in price, offset to a great extent, the shortage in catch. The average price in 1918 was $21.00 per case, compared with $34.50 per case in 1919. The value of the catch of 1919 was, therefore, only $18,816 less than that of the previous year, the 1918 catch being $173,859, against $155,043 in 1919.

It is worth noting in connection with this industry that the prices quoted above were obtained in the American market. Heretofore the bulk of the lobster pack went to the German market, which, in pre-war years, was our best customer. The resumption of trade with that nation, which will in due time follow on settled political and industrial conditions in Europe, should materially contribute to the maintenance of highly remunerative prices for well-packed lobsters.

Minor Branches of Fishery

Minor branches of our staple industy, the fisheries, tierced and canned salmon, frozen salmon and halibut, refined cod-liver oil, are capable of great expansion, and by the application of modern methods which may be found best adapted to our conditions will no doubt prove remunerative to those whose experience and knowledge in the business justify their investing therein.

In the past this country's staple industry, her prolific fisheries, have not received the direction, encouragement and support from Governments which its immeasurable importance to our industrial progress and financial stability demands.

Thus far, Mr. Speaker, in reviewing our trade I have given exclusive attention to the fisheries. While up to the present the fisheries have continued to be the basis on which our economic fabric rests, and will in all probability so continue for many generations to come, there are many other natural resources in this country, the potential wealth of which is immeasurable and has been barely tapped. These may be grouped under three heads—Agriculture, Timber and Mineral resources. Taking them in the order named I shall make brief comment on their present status.

Agriculture

Dealing with Agriculture it is not easy to give exact information as to the areas of development, production, value, etc., owing to the system, or rather I should say the absence of system, in the compilation of statistics. It is an industry, however, which in recenet years has made great progress, and in view of its increasing importance in the domestic pursuits of our population, and the possibilities of future expansion, the Government contemplate devoting special attention to its re-organisation, encouragement and development. The intention of the Government is to inaugurate reforms in that branch of our national industries so as to make it what it should have been long ago, a real and valuable factor in our country's progress.

I do not think any man in public life or in private life in this Dominion who possesses any knowledge of the Agricultural Department's administration of the past will disagree with me when I say that this country has not received the full benefit it sould have derived from the large sums which have been paid out of the revenue of this country for the "encouragement of agriculture." What is most essen-

tial in order to obtain the best results for the expenditure on agriculture is to systematize and bring under the direction of competent departmental experts that branch of the department which may have supervision over the produce of the soil, and the introduction of an improved breed of cattle, horses and sheep. In the near future we anticipate an earnest effort in the directions indicated.

Timber Resources

We have now in operation in this country two large pulp and paper mills, the Anglo-Nfld. Development Co's. mills at Grand Falls, and the A. E. Reed Co's. mills at Bishop's, both situated on the Exploits River.

Last year these two Companies exported 22,819 tons of paper, valued at $1,545,344.00; 3,128 tons of pulp valued at $43,265.00; 4,023 tons of sulphite valued at $431,913.00, making a total valuation for the three commodities of $2,020,522.00. In addition to the above Companies, the coming year will see two other mills exporting from this country, one situated at Lomond, Bonne Bay, and the other at Terra Nova, and it is not too much to expect that as the years pass by this industry will grow to such proportions as will stagger the originators of this industry in our country.

There are also 292 saw mills operating, the annual output of which is approximately 25,155,776 million feet B. M., estimated value of which is $1,006,231.00.

Prior to 1909 the manufacture of paper in this country was regarded as impracticable, and the failure of such an undertaking was confidently predicted by men of wide experience in the business. These opinions and predictions were based on erroneous information relative to the climatic conditions in this country.

The Harmsworths after thorough investigation erected a $6,000,000 plant, and have since then practically duplicated their original outlay at Grand Falls.

From these mills they are supplying the complete requirements of the extensive line of Northcliffe publications in England, and disposing of all the surplus stock they can turn out and ship to United States and other markets. Last year they shipped to the Associated Newspapers of the United States some 50,000 tons of paper and also sent a considerable quantity to Australia.

Brazil, Argentina and Chili have also placed orders for the Grand Falls paper during the past two years, and there is a likelihood of South America becoming a purchaser of Newfoundland paper on a large scale if the market is properly attended to. Before the war Germany supplied a large percentage of South America's paper requirements. The highest testimonials as to the superior quality of Newfoundland paper have come from those who have used it abroad.

The operation of the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Company, and the A. E. Reed Co., have only demonstrated to the world the value of Newfoundland forests as a base of supply for pulp and newsprint. These operations have been a world-wide advertisement for this Country's timber areas and it is bearing good fruit.

Potential Forest Wealth

Ten years ago, Mr. Beeton, of Grand Falls mills, estimated that our pulpwood areas averaged a minimum of nine cords to the acre, and figured the wage value of each cord placed at the mills at $8.00 per cord (at then rate of pay) which represented $72.00 wages from each acre. Speaking on this subject at that time Sir Edward Morris estimated that every square mile of forest land, accepting Mr. Beeton's average yield per acre, represented a value of $45,000 to this

Dominion in labour alone. Continuing he said, "allowing 14,000 square miles of forest land now available at $45,000 per square mile the potential wage-value of our forests would aggregate the enormous sum of $630,000,000." Now, Mr. Speaker, that seems a very great value to place on a single natural resource in this Dominion. I admit it is a huge sum. But the estimate of the forest area which places it at 14,000 square miles of timbered territory is a conservative one. Other estimates place it at 18,000 square miles. The estimate of the cost of placing the raw material at the mills is actually below what that work is now costing the Anglo-Newfoundland Development Co., so I am creditably informed. Taking these two factors into consideration we will not be able to escape arriving at the same estimates as that given by Lord Morris and Mr. Beeton, the latter an expert in forest work and estimates. But assuming that from forest fires, wastage, etc., the total estimated value be reduced 40 per cent. we still have the very large sum of $378,000,000 as a potential earning power for the labourers of this Dominion. This enormous source of wealth has been barely touched. It lies dormant and depreciating awaiting the investment of capital to convert it into gold for our people. These are a few facts which it is the duty of the representatives of the people in this Chamber to deeply ponder over, inquire into, verify and be in a position to deal with intelligently and effectively when the establishing of pulp, paper and lumber operations may demand their attention.

But it is my firm conviction, Mr. Speaker, that it is the bounden duty of the Government of this country to do all in its power to encourage the investment of capital in our forest areas, and not place vexatious restraints upon capital that may offer to develop the dormant resources of this Dominion in any direction, provided always that the interests of the people are safeguarded in all respects. Our lumber and pulp-wood output ought speedily expand to a greater extent than at present and become the most profitable of our industries except the fisheries, and as the industry develops the Dominion exchequer cannot but receive a considerable access of revenue from the manufacturing and marketing of the products of that splendid natural asset.

Our Mineral Wealth

Unsettled conditions during the war arrested many speculative ventures in the prospecting and developing of certain mineral areas. There are indications that this year will witness a resumption of activity in that direction, and let us hope with beneficial results. The Bell Island companies increased their output somewhat last year, but their export up to the end of June 1919 was only 709,300 compared with 731,000 the previous year. Their pre-war export was over a million tons, and we hope to see them reach that figure again this year. The production of other minerals was practically nil.

Native Coal Development

A persistent well-organized effort has been carried on during the past year and is still in operation by the St. George's Coal Fields, Ltd., to develop the coal deposits along the Robinson River areas. Good progress has been made and more extensive operations are likely during the next few months. The very high cost of coal for domestic use makes the development of our own coal areas a national necessity, and it is to be hoped that before long the output of our native mines will be brought within reach of the people at a greatly reduced cost. It seems to have been

satisfactorily demonstrated that the arears referred to above contain extensive deposits of high grade domestic coal, estimated at 2,000,000 tons in sight. No greater boon could be bestowed upon this country than the successful working and marketing of our local coal. Its importance would not be confined to the reduction in price, but in the number of persons engaged in and about the mines, the railways and tram lines, and in the various other direct and indirect results which would flow towards all classes in the Dominion. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the Government would stand fully justified before the country for the investment of a reasonable sum of money to bring to a successful issue the development work already entered upon, and demonstrate once for all that this Dominion does, or does not, possess large deposits of coal of commercial value.

In commenting at such length on the prospects of the utilisation of these natural assets my object is, Mr. Speaker, to direct the attention of this House and of the country at large to the sources of potential wealth within our borders practically untouched, and from which we may find it profitable and expedient to supplement our revenues in the near future to meet the burden which the Dominion is carrying and which it may be necessary to augment to meet the pressing requirements of our trade and transportation.

To provide for the obligations which these requirements must impose is the duty now before us. It is of the very essence of the future financial stability of the Dominion to maintain at the highest possible point the earning power of our people. A declining earning power is invariably followed by decline in Customs Revenue. Our Customs Revenue, that is taxation from our imports, is to-day about 80 per cent. of the total Revenue. Any serious decline in the price of our staple products must of necessity act adversely on our Customs Revenue receipts. It is imperative, therefore, that available sources of additional internal revenue be utilized to the fullest extent, and new revenue producing industries encouraged and developed.

In common with all North American countries we have, during the past three years, been enjoying what all economists concede to be a fictitious prosperity. It is what has come to be designated as "war prosperity." We have been passing through a cycle of prosperity the result, not of expanding trade but of abnormal returns from the products of toil on land and sea.

We have been measuring our prosperity in terms of money—not in what money will buy. This applies to the people as a whole and has largely contributed to make "profiteering" easy and profitable. The late Ministry were not exempt from this financial fallacy. They, too, measured the country's prosperity in money and not in what it could buy. They received huge revenues and found surpluses mounting annually of which they boasted greatly. It was nothing to boast of. If, under normal conditions, such surpluses were produced they may have been regarded as an index of the expanding volume of trade, and may justly be pointed to with pride by the Ministry and by the Minister responsible for the fiscal policy of the Government, but with money cheap and commodities dear even if you tried you could not avoid having a surplus.

To provide for the requirements of the state without unduly burdening these from whom provision therefor is drawn should be the chief aim of

tariff-makers and revenue-estimators. The late Government disregarded that sound principle. Their sole concern appeared to be the accumulation of revenues far in excess of normal requirements, and they made prodigal use of them. Their disbursement of a large portion of these revenues evidenced neither wisdom nor prudence. On ordinary business principles alone, the prudent husbanding of the country's resources was dictated by existing conditions and considerations of practical wisdom and good sense which should have imbued them with concern for the lean years which the late Minister of Finance admitted in his Budget Speech of last year were probable.

With successive revenues greatly in excess of the Dominion's ordinary requirements the late administration had a great opportunity to make provision in the days of plenty for the uncertainties of the future, to conserve their income for emergencies, but it would seem that the more wealth the revenues produced the more the late Government squandered. Plethoric revenues, the result of abnormal conditions, they attributed to the wisdom of their rule, but over which they had no more control than over the ebb and flow of the Atlantic tides. But over the expenditure of those revenues they did have control, and therein they failed to exercise it to permanent loss of this position.

In this connection the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, the ex-Minister of Finance, had a duty to do, the performance of which would have redounded very greatly to his credit, and that was the judicious and economical administration of the large revenues and large surpluses which the toil and labour of our people entrusted to his keeping. The manner in which a great portion of those surpluses was expended evidences reckless extravagance, instead of prudent frugality, which the then present conditions and future outlook would suggest to a careful and prudent steward of his country's resources. It is unnecessary for me to enlarge on this phase of the subject. Honourable members need only refer to the public accounts and to the Auditor General's report to inform themselves as to the manner in which the late Administration discharged these weighty and serious obligations to the revenue producers of this Dominion.

The expenditure of the large revenues contributed by the people, and millions of dollars raised on loan within the Dominion and outside was marked by the utter absence of method, economy, principle, regularity, frugality and care of the people's resources. Indeed, the latter months of the late administration, were marked by a reckless extravagance unparalleled in the public life of this Dominion. It was in all respects a prodigal administration revelling in an ill-ordered squandering of the public wealth.

Before closing permit me to refer briefly to the subject most uppermost in the minds of the industrial classes in this country, namely the prospects of an early decline in the cost of the necessaries of life.

The Government availed of the earliest opportunity to take Legislative power to deal with the most important phase of the subject, that of profiteering. It is of paramount importance that the masses be safeguarded against the imposition of unfair, unjust, and unnecessary burdens either in the way of excessive revenues or exorbitant charges on the necessaries of life. It is predicted by some students of economic conditions that an early receding in prices of the most essential commodities may be anticipated. But on this subject

there are many and divergent views held.

Mr. Herbert C. Hoover, speaking on the subject a few months ago said, "the law of supply and demand is not working normally and probably will not for another year. While prospective food supplies for the next twelve months are about equal to the apparent need, unstable political situations, a recurring shortage in shipping, a shortage of credit, and a combination of either buyers or sellers will tend to create great speculative waves and may inflate prices to a point unendurable to the consumer, or in the reverse situation unendurable to the farmer."

In his Annual Report the President of the Bank of Montreal said,—"The high cost of living, about which so much is being said, and for the relief of which so many remedies are suggested, is a world-wide, and not a local, condition." Continuing he attributed the chief cause of high cost of living to "the pressing demand of European countries for commodities of every nature at abnormally high prices. We cannot, therefore, expect any considerable amelioration in living conditions until the world's demands are satisfied and Europe once more returns to an exporting basis. . . . . Food prices will without doubt be the soonest overcome, and I think we may look forward confidently to a reduction in the cost of all commodities both at home and abroad after another harvest, to be followed in the natural sequence by a reduction in the scale of wages; but the process promises to be gradual and marked, and a rapid decline in the near future does not seem probable."

Generally speaking the concensus of opinion of men best qualified to speak authoritatively on such matters seems to be that there will be no marked downward tendency in prices in the immediate future. And although the prospect may not be a pleasant one it is as well that our people look forward to a continuance of present prices in most of the necessaries of life for the remaining months of this year and probably the greater part of next.

For these reasons it should be our aim and policy to augment our financial strength by multiplying our productive exertions. The great necessity of exercising rigid economy and reducing to minimum expenditures upon luxuries and non-essentials should be impressed upon our people.

Conclusion

We are now entering upon the period of after-war reconstruction and readjustment. Despite many difficulties and uncertainties this country emerged from the great conflict with undiminished vigor in industrial pursuits, her local manufacturing concerns operating to capacity investment in our staple industry, the fisheries, up to the standard of pre-war years, and our financial stability unimpaired. Labor in every industry and employment is receiving remuneration commensurate with the increased cost of living.

Business generally is adjusting itself in a satisfactory way to changing conditions and the banks report that obligations are being met in a satisfactory manner, and that savings deposits show an average increase in addition to considerable investment in the local loan during the year, which speaks well for the industry and thrift of our people.

I now move, Mr. Speaker, that this House go into Committee of the Whole to consider Fays and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs 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 Thursday.

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

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act to confirm a Contract made by the Government with the Terra Nova Sulphite Company Ltd." was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

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

Answer to question of Mr. Bennett.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—The work of the Civil Service Commission has not yet been completed. A number of interim reports have been received, but these are in the nature of confidential documents and it would not be in the general interest to make them public. The Auditor General has for some little time been out of the Colony. He is the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. He is presumed to have left for Newfoundland on the tenth instant.

MR. BENNETT:—Then no final report has yet been received.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—No final report has been received. A number of unsigned interim reports have been received.

MR. BENNETT:—Then the Estimates are not based upon the report of the Civil Service Commission.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—In some particulars the Estimates are based upon the Interim reports of the Civil Service Commission and in others not so based.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked the Hon. Colonial Secretary what arrangements have been made between the Reid Nfld. Co. and the Government, re the reconstruction of the Railway. If any Legislation re same to be brought down this session.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—No arrangements have been made with the Reid Newfoundland Company re the reconstruction of the railway and the matter has not yet reached a point so that I can make any definite statement whether legislation shall be introduced this session re the same.

MR. WALSH asked the Hon. the Prime Minister if the steamer "Carman" was purchased by the Government, or if chartered. If purchased, what was the purchase price, if chartered, what are the terms of charter, and for what purpose is said steamer to be used.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—The "Carman" has been hired by the Government at the rate of sixty dollars per day, the owners paying insurance and the Government paying all other charges. The steamer is being used in connection with the Customs Protection Work. She was engaged for the Customs Service but has been transferred to the Mail Service temporarily.

SIR M. P. CASHIN asked the Hon. Minister of Justice if it is correct that His Excellency the Governor is about to leave the city within the next week for a tour of the Island, and if not when; if it is His Excellency's intention to appoint the promised Commission to inquire into the Woodford affidavit before he leaves, and if not why not; also what steps His Excellency proposes to take, if he does not appoint a Commissioner before leaving, to expedite action in this matter; also if it is desirable in the interest of the maintenance of respect for the administration of justice in this country that action in this matter, which first received

publicly almost three months ago, should be longer delayed seeing that a Commission was promised before the opening of the Legislature, which has now been in session two months, and that His Excellency in a communication addressed to the Opposition party on May 21st intimated that he was "on the point of obtaining such a Commission."

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I understand from His Excellency that it is not correct that he is about to leave the city for a tour of the Island. He is only leaving the city for a day to address the G.W.V.A. at Grand Falls. It is the intention of His Excellency to appoint the promised Commission. This is an answer to the first part of the question. As to the last portion of it as to the desirability in the interest of the maintenance of respect for the administration of justice, etc., I am not in a position to express any opinion.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to amend 9 and 10 Geo. V Cap. XV respecting elections in the present year" 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.

Second reading of Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 143 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Keeping of Dogs.'"

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—I ask to have it deferred.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I beg to lay upon the table of the House a copy of the Annual Report of the General Hospital for the year ending December 31st, 1919.

Mr. Bennett gave notice of question.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, June 16th, 1920.

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

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, I find on my desk a letter from Mr. John J. St. John, Secretary of the Moderate Prohibition Committee, under date June 16th, which reads as follows:

"Enclosed please find several petitions for presentation to the House of "Assembly asking for a modification of "the present Prohibition Act. Kindly "present same at the earliest.

"Yours truly,

"(Sgd.) J. J. ST. JOHN,

"Secretary Moderate Prohibition "Committee.

I accordingly ask leave to present petitions Nos. 6, 8, 20, 48 and 74.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in presenting a number of petitions asking for a modification of the Prohibition Act. I would ask that they be referred to the Commission.

MR. SAMSON:—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a number of petitions from the district of Twillingate asking for a modification of the present Prohibition Act.

MR. SMALL:—I ask leave to present a petition from the residents of La Poile asking that there be a modification of the Prohibition Act.

MR. HIBBS:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from the residents of Joe Batt's Arm, District of Fogo, asking for a modification of the Prohibition Act.

MR. HIBBS:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a number of petitions from the residents of Lumsden, Doting Cove,

Musgrave Hr., Ladle Cove, Carmanville, Horwood, Change Islands, Seldom Come By, Joe Batt's Arm, Tilting and Fogo asking that the railway be extended down the north side of Bonavista Bay and straight shore of Fogo District to Carmanville. The people residing in this section of the country are more handicapped than any other part of Newfoundland. No other section of the Dominion is so much hampered by lact of transportation facilities as is the straight shore of the district of Fogo.

The matter has been brought before this House on more than one occasion before and petitions have been presented asking for this railway extension.

The petitions which I present to-day are very largely and influentially signed, and I think with the exception of those asking for a modification of the Prohibition Act are the most important, numerically speaking, of any presented during the session.

I do not think this House is fully aware of the hardships that the industrious people residing in this section have suffered and what impediments they are subjected to because of their isolation.

There is not a harbor from Lumsden to Carmanville along that bleak and inhospitable shore, and the inconvenience and loss that the fishermen of the straight shore suffer as a consequence of this cannot be estimated in dollars and cents. The building of a harbour on the straight shore must be regarded as a very big undertaking which would mean tremendous expense, yet it is a matter that warrants the attention and consideration of the Government.

In the absence of any safe harbour along the coast mentioned there seems to be no other remedy but to give those people a back door, so to speak, in the form of a railroad.

Now, I want to be frank and say that I do not expect the Government to build this railroad during the year 1920 or 1921.

The petitioners in asking for this railroad realize that the movement is more or less in the nature of getting down our stake so that when the proper time arrives, when the finances of the Colony can bear it the first branch railroad which shall be built will the one from Gambo to Carmanville, or better still to Farewell.

There are great natural resources along that section which can never be developed, while the people are living in the state of isolation that they are at the present time. I shall embrace every opportunity that offers to drive home to the Government the necessity of this railway.

There is a lot of agricultural land situated along the straight shore which could be tapped by such a road where now the people are simply confined to their own immediate settlements, not even having roads by which they may develop the better agricultural areas situated further in the country.

I would like to again impress a serious fact upon the Government which must not be overlooked and that is that people resident in certain sections of Fogo district, particularly Gander Bay, have undergone great suffering this spring through shortage of provisions. They have even been borrowing from one another for some time past, and I understand there is not a barrel of flour to be bought in Gander Bay, and the good people in that part of the district have been sharing out their own stocks of provisions in order to ward off starvation from those who have suffered most by the shortage.

One of their chief reasons for this horrible state of affairs is the incapacity of the little steamer "Susu" to cope with the requirements of the dis-

trict. This coupled with the cutting off of the other steamers from certain sections last year have brought about this deplorable condition of affairs.

It must be remembered that the same sections that I have referred to have not received a mail for the last six weeks, and surely it cannot be contended that any reasonable excuse can be given for this kind of treatment to any section of Newfoundland in this twentieth century. This must not and will not happen again if I have any power to prevent it.

Ice conditions practically cut off the entire district from communication by water during certain months of the year, and while this is a condition over which we have no control it shows more forcibly than anything else the necessity of a railroad which will place the people to some extent independent of commerce by water, and give them an opportunity to carry on uninterruptedly their usual trade and industries.

I realise that the Government has a big project on its hands in the form of our main trunk line, which it is only natural to assume must have its first and most urgent consideration, but I repeat again that just as soon as the financial condition of this country will warrant the extension of branch lines I shall expect the Government to accede to the request made by so many of my constituents on the petitions which I have presented to-day, asking for this railroad, which not only will be of inestimable benefit to the people residing on the straight shore, but it will also enable the residents of Fogo Islands and Change Islands to connect with a modern means of transportation by a couple of hours run in a motor boat.

I expect the honourable members who represent the District of Bonavista to support me in advocating the building of this road as the District of Bonavista and Fogo are contigious, and such a road would tap the north side of Bonavista Bay as well as the straight shore of Fogo.

Mr. Speaker, I have very much pleasure in presenting these petitions today, and in giving them my heartiest support I trust the Government will take this matter up in earnest and that the time is not far distant when the prayer of this petition will be acceded to.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS (Mr. Hlafyard):—I support the petition presented by the honourable member for Fogo.

MR. WINSOR:—I support the petition presented by the honourable member for Fogo and the remarks he made were quite true. A railroad is the only thing that can relieve the great suffering down there. Bonavista Bay in some cases may have good harbours but these do not and cannot relieve the situation when the harbours are blocked with ice. Good harbours are of no use when the ice comes along. We want a railroad on the north side of Bonavista Bay. Last year petitions were presented from the people of the north side of Bonavista Bay asking that something along those lines be done and I notice that a few days ago the Motor Association of this town presented petitions asking for the repair of the motor roads which we must admit are more for pleasure than for service and then the Government brought in resolutions embodying the request of the motorists and then a Bill was introduced to give effect to them. And since the request of the petition is necessary I think the Government ought to take the matter into serious consideration.

MR. ABBOTT:—I support the petition presented by the honourable member for Fogo and as soon as possible the railroad ought to be extended down the north side of Bonavista Bay.

MR. SULLIVAN:—I ask leave to

present a number of petitions from the people of St. Mary's and Placentia asking that some measure be introduced for the modification of the Prohibition law. This petition is largely signed, it has one thousand signatures appended to it. And in view of the number of petitions coming into this House I think it is only fair and right to the people of the country that some steps be taken during this session that may have for its object the meeting of the wishes of the numerous petitioners. I give these petitions my hearty support and ask they be referred to the Department to which they relate.

MR. WALSH:—I support the petitions.

MR. SINNOTT:—I have much pleasure in supporting the petitions presented by my honourable colleague.

MR. BENNETT:—On behalf of the honourable member for Port de Grave, Sir John Crosbie, I ask leave to present a petition from that district on the question of the modification of the Prohibition Act. This is in keeping with the petition presented yesterday and is very largely signed and therefore I have much pleasure in presenting them on behalf of the honourable member. I also have several petitions from the people of St. John's West on the same subject. These petitions contain many of the prominent constituents I have the honour to represent. As the matter is assuming very large proportions I ask that the Government take the matter up and give us a pronouncement as to their intention in this matter. I have much pleasure in supporting the petitions and ask that they be referred to the department to which they relate.

MR. MOORE:—I beg to present a petition from the district of Ferryland, Witless Bay and Fermeuse asking for a modification of the Prohibition Act. I give this petition my hearty support.

MR. HIGGINS:—I have a bunch of petitions here containing over one thousand names and they are along the same lines of those already presented from St. John's East, namely, the modification of the Prohibition Act. In presenting these petitions and in light of the suggestion made on this side of the House as to the intention of the Government I repeat what I have said before that I support the prayer of the petition and I make that repetition today for this purpose that in asking the Government to do something in the matted the leader of the House has announced that a Commission will be appointed to enquire into the prevailing conditions but as it will not be able to report until the next session of the House the second part of the petition is more important than it would be otherwise. The second part of the request is that a Plebiscite be taken. This is undoubtedly a reasonable request and I support the request not because of my personal objection to the conditions prevailing to-day but because the request itself it strikes me, is largely supported throughout the country and I think the Government ought before this session closes give further thought to that matter and that aspect of the request is important. I have much pleasure in presenting the petitions.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition from all the residents of Jersey Side, Placentia. This petition requests the amount of $5000 for a break-water at that place. During the storms of last fall and winter the break-water was swept away. It is absolutely essential that this matter be attended to as soon as possible if the Government wished to protect the lives and property of the people of this place. The amount may seem large, but the break-water covers a very large stretch and it will require that amount to do the work. This break-water not only affects the people of Jersey Side but the entire district, and I hope the

Government and the Minister will see their way clear to do this without delay. I might also point out that the request comes from the Committee in charge of local affairs. Mr. Speaker, I give this petition my unqualified support and hope that the prayer of the petition will be seriously considered as soon as possible by the Hon. Minister and the Government.

Mr. Sullivan:—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting this petition. It is very necessary that this matter be attended to before the bad weather sets in. The absence of such a break-water or the loss of the one that was there places the lives and property there in a dangerous position, and the matter cannot be attended to too quickly. I have pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in supporting the prayer of the petition.

MR. SINNOTT:—Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting this petition.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on to-morrow move the House into Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions respecting certain concessions to the Dominion Cooperative Building Association Ltd.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, about a year ago the Hon. John Anderson, member of the Legislative Council; Mr. James McGrath, then President of the Longshoremen's Union; Hon. M. P. Gibbs, member of the Legislative Council, in conjunction with certain other gentlemen moved in the matter of Workingmen's Homes in the city of St. John's during the early summer of 1919. It was my privilege to be in conference with these gentlemen and assist them in their organization work. When in August, 1919, I was asked to undertake the leadership of the Liberal Reform Party on the Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Bond indicating that he was not prepared to undertake the leadership of the party to contest the then pending general election, I was waited on by these and other gentlemen and was asked to look into the proposition. I did so, and was glad to lend them my hearty cooperation and support in their public-spirited undertaking. After the election of November 3rd, when my party was elected to office, a deputation waited upon me seeking concessions on three points. First, the free duty into Newfoundland of such building material as was not procurable in Newfoundland; second, the guarantee of interest on the paid-up capital stock of the company at the rate of five per cent per annum for a period of twenty years; third, that in the event of the incorporation of a company funds would be provided through the companies' bankers to meet drafts and other financial obligations in connection with orders which would be placed by the company to secure building material for delivery this spring in the event of such becoming due before the legislature would have an opportunity of dealing with free entry, and the guarantee of five per cent dividend, as they thought that the company which they intended to incorporate should not make any substantial call on its prospective share-holders until the Legislature had dealt with these two matters. I assured the gentlemen who waited upon me that the matter of free entry would be accorded, that a guarantee of five per cent would be given, and I also assured them that arrangements would be made that the financial assistance

which they required would be forthcoming. Subsequently a company was incorporated, it being regarded as a philanthropic rather than a business undertaking. The company was permitted by Order in Council to register free of cost in accordance with the provisions of the Companies' Act in that regard. I then got in touch with some of the leading gentlemen connected with the company and asked them to submit to me in writing their request in the matter of free entry and guarantee, which being done a Bill was drafted covering fully the undertaking which I had months before given these gentlemen and covering fully the present request. This is not a program for which the Government itself desires to take any credit. The person entitled to the major portion of credit for this undertaking is the Hon. John Anderson, who has given a very large amount of time, industry and attention to the development of the program. The directors of the company regard it as a philanthropic proposition and not merely as a business undertaking. They assured me they can get all the capital that they require on a five per cent guarantee and the free entry of such supplies as most of necessity be imported into the Colony. Within the last day or two they have sought credit to the amount of $25,000 to liquidate immediate demands owing to the arrival of goods ordered some time ago as supplies for the construction of houses during the winter, and arrangements are being made so that accommodation may be provided them through their bankers, the accommodation being temporary only, as immediately after the passing of this legislation they will call upon their shareholders for an amount which will enable them to liquidate such temporary accommodation and have sufficient funds to carry on their operations for the coming year. The first section of the Bill authorities the payment to the company of any sum by which the net earnings of the company shall be less than five per cent per annum upon so much of the capital of the company as shall be actually paid-up in cash and engaged in and about the construction of dwelling houses in Newfoundland. Section 2 is the usual provision for payment only upon the certificate of the Auditor General, the company to furnish the Minister of Finance and Customs at the end of each year certain statements and to provide facilities for the examination of books by the Auditor General. In the event of any dispute arising between the company's auditor and the Auditor General the matter shall be referred to the arbitration of any public chartered accountant, whose award shall be final. Under Section 3 all building material and machinery imported into the Colony by the company for use in its business and not of a kind and description manufactured in this Colony shall be admitted free of duty for a period of twenty years. Under Section 4 one-third of the directors of the company shall be nominated by the Government. This last section is new and is an indication of the policy of the Government that whenever any company desires a guarantee of interest on the capital which it invests in any particular undertaking the Government shall have the right to be represented on the directorate of the company, so that the Government may be informed from time to time as to the management and undertakings of the company and the Government may always be assured that the company is efficiently managed, its accounts properly kept and is doing its best to make a success of its enterprise. These resolutions carry out fully the understanding between the gentlemen who organized the company and myself with respect to Government assistance to be given this im-

portant enterprise and fully covers the request that has been made upon the Government in this regard. I consequently move that this House do now resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on these resolutions.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—The Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. introducer of these resolutions if he can give us more definite information with respect to this matter. How is the money to be raised? A Government guarantee of 5% is not sufficient to raise money on. This is not a business proposition. I would like to know very much whether the Government intends to loan the money, or whether they intend getting it outside, and if the interest is not going to be more than 5%. I have an idea that this is another piece of camouflage such as we are being treated to this session.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—This is not regarded as a business undertaking. A large number of the share-holders are subscribing to the capital stock of the company as a matter of philanthrophy and not for profit. Money could not possibly be secured in the markets for a mere commercial venture at the present time on a five per cent guarantee. A very large proportion of those who will be shareholders in this company seek no guarantee. There are, however, some share-holders who desire to secure some return to the extent of feeling that they may be guaranteed to get back in dividends as much as the principal sum which they invest. In the twenty years the shareholders will have got back in interest the entire amount of principal invested. Interest in the Savings' Bank, in which the principal is absolutely secure is three per cent, and there are undoubtedly some who feel that they should be making two per cent more on this money than if it were in the Savings Bank, when from the standpoint of philanthrophy they make an investment to put through the company's program. This is, as I have already said, not a business proposition; it is a proposition with which people who have means and desire to help out the housing situation in St. John's have associated themselves for the purpose of doing something for the cause to which the Hon. John Anderson, Mr. James McGrath and Hon. M. P. Gibbs and others have given a considerable amount of time and effort. I understand that some leading firms, such as Messrs. Bowring Brothers, Ltd., are substantial subscribers to the capital stock of the company. These gentlemen are not investing their money to get a five per cent dividend; these gentlemen are not investing their money for the purpose of getting the capital back; they prefer, however, to make their donation in the form of an investment and put the amount in the hands of a limited liability company rather than in the form of a straight donation.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Speaker, before the House goes into committee I want to say that the terms of these resolutions are a decided disappointment to me in the sense that while the Hon. Prime Minister has pointed out that they comply in every detail with the requests of the company, we must look at the thing coldly and brutally from the standpoint of what they are calculated to do in the way of giving encouragement to this project, and if we do so we must admit that the Bill does absolutely nothing at all to help in the building of workingmen's homes. It appears from the resolutions that the company has asked the Government for the free admission of such materials as they may need in the construction of these houses but there is nothing in that for which the Government can take the slightest credit to themselves because that very same thing is done for anyone who wishes to

build a hen's house, it is done in the case of fox farms and in fact in numerous projects that have none of the features that this has to recommend it. As for the five per cent guarantee, it will certainly not influence anyone to put their money into it as a business proposition and consequently the Government has done nothing.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I did not say that we were doing anything.

MR. HIGGINS:—I am glad you admit, and now Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Prime Minister has made this admission, I might say that I had looked forward, when we got a change of government, to having a new town, judging from the pre-election praises and hopes of the Prime Minister, but of course if St. John's has to bow to the will and power of the outport districts I suppose we must forgive the Prime Minister for his failure to bring about a realization of his promises in this direction, but for us to consider that in these resolutions we are doing angthing to assist in the building of these workingmen's houses, why it is too far-fetched to talk about. Another point, when we consider the number of offeerers who have tendered donations towards the movement we know that they have done so, as the Prime Minister intimated, in the spirit of doing something to help a deserving cause, they have done it in the spirit of generosity because they have the money, but it should be remembered that in this building proposition the capital of the country should be available and the Government should be prepared to assist in an special degree, in an unusual manner in this housing scheme and I think hon. members will not deny that. Those who have already offered money are not looking to getting a return of 5% and surely the Government is not going to ask us to accept the proposition that this five per cent guarantee will have the slightest weight in influencing persons who have money to invest it in this way for the sake of the returns they are likely to get. It ought at least be made eight per cent, because if we are going to encourage people to put their money into the project we must make it attractive for them. So far as the returns on the houses themselves are concerned, it will I think be readily agreed that nobody is going to build houses for rent as a business proposition; you are not going to get the money out of these houses to pay any kind of a dividend on the money put into them because even to meet the expenses of wear and tear and the general up-keep of the houses the rents will have to be excessive. I am not speaking now in a critical sense at all, but members like the Hon. Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance, who are doubtless better acquainted with these matters than most of the other hon. gentlemen on the other side, must know that if we are going to touch the thing at all, we should give the necessary encouragement by this five per cent guarantee. Take for example the Hr. Grace Dry Dock and the Bell Island Tramway, the guaranteed dividends in these cases were merely a means of safety for shareholders, both were absolute certainties, calculated business propositions from the beginning, but this idea of building houses in the city is not to be considered for a moment as a business proposition or as a likely investment but rather from the standpoint of the necessity which exists for them amongst the working people, and if we are going to give any guarantee on the money that is put into them let us make it something that will at least make the invetment attractive for those who wish to put their money in. There is surely nothing in this Bill to congratulate the Government upon

and the Leader of the Government now says that the Government does not profess to be doing anything in the matter. I am glad at any rate that he has had the honesty to admit that much and there will be an opportunity later to say a word or two with regard to this point.

MR. BENNETT:—Mr. Speaker, I must say that I rise with a feeling of disappointment at the resolutions just submitted by the Hon. Prime Minister on a matter in connection with which so much had been expected from him. When we consider that this very thing played such a prominent part in bringing him and his colleague back to this Chamber, it is difficult to realize that this is to be the extent of his efforts.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Do you mean the by-election or the general election?

MR. BENNETT:—Both. From the prominent place which the Government's supposed action with regard to the building of workingmen's homes occupied in the Speech from the Throne, I felt that the limitation of their encouragement to the sum of $60,000 was not very generous but the resolutions we have here now fall far short of even that effort, and promise absolutely nothing and I am sure that the disappointment I feel in this matter will be felt by every working man in this city when they realize how they have been fooled and hunted. I am sorry for the Prime Minister and his colleague because in my opinion they should have fought to the last trench in an effort to keep their promises to those whose support was secured by them. I can appreciate the difficulties of a government constituted as this one is, swayed as it is by the outport interests but I believe that the outports could be brought to realize the great need for these houses in St. John's and that they in their generosity would agree to such concessions as would help to eliminate the sufferings caused by present housing conditions.

I notice that according to the first section of these resolutions, the company is not confined to St. John's but as you will notice by the last line in this first section, they can go anywhere in the Colony. The company can go to Bonavista Bay if they wish or to Trinity or Conception Bays. I have no fault to find with this, but I contend that it is not necessary, there is no need for such reform, as the Leader of the Government terms it, in the outports. Certain persons connected with this movement were very prominent during the election last fall. In fact the prime movers perhaps were sincere in their efforts but they took very good care to be identified with the present government and some of them went out of their way to misrepresent myself and others. During the time of Mr. Halfyard as Colonial Secretary a communication was sent to him from the Hon. John Anderson in reference to the housing scheme but it was never replied to. I was told about this matter upon taking over this office and I immediately sent a reply.

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS:—I respectfully take this opportunity Mr. Speaker to explain to the House why I did not make a reply to this communication referred to by the hon. member for St. John's West. Mr. Anderson sent a further letter saying that he had sent a letter to the Colonial Secretary but he did not get a reply to it, he also states that he sent a letter to the Prime Minister of England but received a reply. The letter to which Mr. Bennett referred was sent to me on the morning of the 16th or 17th of September, 1918. That morning I took passage on the Susu for Catalina as you are probably aware at that time the shooting season opens and this is the only opportunity I get to take a holiday. I came back two

weeks later and found that the Deputy Minister had failed to acknowledge receipt of the letter. That communication was then put on the Agenda. The next time I saw that letter it was marked "stand over" so therefore I am not responsible for not making a reply.

MR. BENNETT:—Who marked it "standover"?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS:—Sir Michael Cashin I presume, he was then Prime Minister, and there's the reason why the Hon. John Anderson didn't get a reply. I am glad of the opportunity that has been given me by the hon. member for St. John's West to explain this matter.

MR. BENNETT:—I don't think the hon. member has altered the situation any. I don't think that hon. minister is discourteous and is probably correct in his reply but it is surprising that the Deputy didn't do the necessary. I feel that we should all be one on this very important question, the conditions in the town to-day ought to be relieved and I am sure the men on this side of the House will back up the Government, but it is very disappointing to me that the Government has not taken this matter more seriously. You won't raise a dollar on that guarantee. Sir Edgar Bowring or the Hon. J. D. Ryan or some other wealthy men may from a philanthropic viewpoint contribute a sum of money, but they would probably do it without any guarantee. I think that it is unworthy of the Government and its introducer to bring in such a bill. In days gone by a 5% guarantee as pointed out by the hon. Mr. Higgins on the Hr. Grace dockyard or the Bell Island tramway or the Placentia and Carbonear Water Company was a very good investment as money was very plentiful in those days and the percentage was very low but you don't raise a dollar to-day on a 5% guarantee. What is the use of throwing dust in the eyes of the people of St. John's on such a matter of great vital importance. The guarantee only runs for 20 years, what is to happen after that? A twenty year guarantee and then no provision for what is to come after. What is going to happen after that? The houses will be getting old then and to ask the people of St. John's to take a proposal like that I think would be a slur on the intelligence of the community. I am sorry that the Government is not big hearted enough to come forward and do something because after all it is the capital city and the working classes are always at a great disadvantage. People in the outports generally have their own house, a cow and some sheep and their own garden but the great majority of the working men in the city have nothing to call their own. Picture the case of the man in the city who has a family and is working hard from morning till night to support that family and he is living away in one of the back streets and his health breaks down there is nothing left for him but a charitable institution. This is brought by the environment and unsanitory condition in which they are compelled to live in. There is no more important subject to come into this House than this, and it is occupying the attention of statesmen all over the world. Any money spent in the building of houses is money well invested. It would be far better for us to do something in this direction than to be devoting money for the improvement of hospitals and insane asylums and poor houses and other institutions.

As to the fact that the Government will allow materials to come in duty free, that is merely a drop in the bucket. For the class of houses that will be constructed by this Dominion Building Cooperative Association, ninety per cent of the material will be found in our own country. Outside of the hardware necessary for locks and hinges, the material will be found at

our own doors, and therefore the Government will not be giving any great concession, when they admit material duty free. Iam afraid if the policy outlined by these resolutions, is to be followed, that there is very little hope of any appreciable advance on these lines. You may build ten, fifteen or twenty houses, but we want hundreds of houses, in this town, to-day, and nothing less will do to relieve the situation, and the day of reckoning will come unless those who are charged with the responsibility will take up this matter in the proper way and make some effort to bring about some reform of a far-reaching nature. They will have to take the resopnsibility of a breach of trust, because all kinds of promises were made to the people of this city by honourable members on the other side of the House, and the people who voted for them are expecting something of a tangible nature. They cannot live on promises, fresh air is good, but it is not sufficient for breakfast. The Hon. the Prime Minister is muttering something unintelligible behind his paper. If he has anything to say why does he not put away his paper and speak out like a man. I think Mr. Speaker that it is indecent for the Hon. the Prime Minister to sit behind a paper, and throw out an insult to any hon. member who is speaking on the oflors of this House.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I did not say anything to the hon. member for St. John's West.

MR. BENNETT:—However Mr. Speaker, I wish once again to express my serious disappointment and regret that the Government have broken faith with many of those who voted for them and who deserved better at their hands. The Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs says that they will get what they were promised. Well, it is a case of live horse, and eat grass. I am sure that these resolutions will go down in history as one of the most feeble attempts ever made to meet a contingency which should have liberal treatment at the hands of the Government.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—Mr. Speaker, before this section passes, as a shareholder in this Company, I would like to say that I think that this is a very dangerous section. The Municipal Council have built houses under the supervision of Mr. J. Coaker, and on all the material that went into those houses duty was paid, and I think that this Company should pay duty also. I contend that a man from Hr. Grace has as much right to get material duty free as a man in St. John's, and any man in Newfoundland has as much right to get material duty free as this Association. I think that if the Government would loan this Company fifteen or twenty thousand dollars, and let them pay the duty, that it would be better. A man might go down to the Finance and Customs Department and get ten or twenty barrels of cement, and he would want it duty free ,and if we give this Association that privilege, and keep it from others, you will have trouble, and for that reason I would like to see this section altered.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Chairman, before this section passes I would like to ask the Prime Minister whether it is the intention of the Government to change the interest from five to eight per cent.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—The Company asked for five per cent. They stated that they had all the capital that they required, and the request in maximum from them, has been granted in these resolutions.

MR. HIGGINS:—If there is any correspondence on the housing question can we have it on to-morrow?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—If there is any correspondence, in this connection, it will be tabled to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker resumed the chair.

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

On motion this report was received an dadopted and the Bill entitled "An Act respecting Certain Concessions to the Dominion Co-operative Building Association Ltd." was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

MR. BENNETT:—To ask the Hon. Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House the report of the Commission appointed by the late Government to enquire into the salaries of the Civil Service.

HON. COLONIAL SECRETARY:—Mr. Speaker, the work of the Civil Service Commission is not yet completed, though there are a number of interim reports furnished the Government by the Commission.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—You did not base your Estimates on those interim reports.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—We based them upon consideration of the interim reports and in so far as the Estimates furnished were already passed upon.

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 Certificates of Masters and Mates" with some amendments in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, these amendments are merely verbal. The operation of the Act is extended six months. After the word "shipping" in section (1) add the words "any two of them will act." The Board comprises three members. In section (2) is amended by adding the words "such rules and regulations when approved of by the Governor in Council and published in the Royal Gazette shall have the force and effect of law." Section (4) is amended by striking out the words "January 1st, 1921," and substituting therefor the words "June 30th, 1921."

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the Government to these amendments, because it will be distinctly remembered that the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries stated when this Bill was before the House that this thing would only extend until the end of this year and these were the reasons that prompted us to support the Bill. I direct this question particularly to the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries and to ask him as to why he changed his view.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—Mr. Speaker, this matter was referred to a Select Committee. Among the members of that Committee were several ship-owners, who urged the change, because of the fact that many masters and mates would be leaving Newfoundland soon and going away and would not probably return for seven or eight months, and that if we did not extend the Act that they would be prevented from going. That is the reason why the change was made.

Second reading of Bill entitled "An Act to confirm a Contract made by the Government with the Terra Nova Sulphite Co., Ltd."

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the second reading of that Act. The Terra Nova Sulphite Co., Ltd., are formed to carry on a pulp industry at Alexander Bay on the Terra Nova River. Negotiations were commenced with the late Government for certain concessions and the only difference in the agreement is that this Government now pro-

poses to charge so much per horse power for the water power developed by the Company.

Second reading of Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Companies Act."

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, I would say that this Bill will not be of any interest to many members of the House. It is merely to give power to the present Companies Act, which is incorporated by Charter.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, June 17th, 1920.

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

MR. ABBOTT:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the residents of Port Blandford for the sum of $1000.00 to repair the Main Road from one end of Port Blandford to the other, a distance of four miles. It seems that this road has gone without repairs for a long time and that several bridges are in a very bad condition. I ask that this petition be sent to the department to which it relates and that the prayer of the petition be given due consideration.

MR. WINSOR:—Mr. Speaker, I have pleasure in supporting this petition.

MR. SMALL:—Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Mr. LeGrow I ask leave to present a petition from the residents of Broad Cove asking for sufficient funds to build a launchway in that place.

MR. GOSSE:—Mr. Speaker, knowing the place and the need I have pleasure in supporting this petition.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, I am to-day in receipt of a petition without covering letter signed by a number of representative citizens of the electoral district of St. John's West protesting against any modification in the present Prohibition legislation and seeking for a vigorous enforcement of the Act as it at present stands. As this document has been forwarded to me I conclude that the sender intended that it should be dealt with formally, and I now ask leave to present the petition to the House.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Speaker, before we go on to the order of the day I would like to draw the attention of the House and particularly the Leader of the Government in the absence of the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to a message that come from Bay de Verde district. This is a serious matter. I think it will be recognized that this method of carrying on public service is of no credit to ourselves. This matter is of such a character that an immediate investigation should be made. We have heard a lot of the Postal Telegraph business. Some business men of the town have declined to do business through the Postal Telegraph. There is no secrecy. This latest aspect is most serious. This prostitution of a public service is certainly one that no honorable member wants to stand for, consequently I ask that the matter be immediately investigated and that the result of the investigation be made public. I feel sure that if there is an investigation that it will in some measure restore confidence in the system. We cannot compete with the Anglo, and this incident shows why. No business is secret. I consequently ask that the Colonial Secretary in the absence of the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs have this matter looked into.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, the value of a telegraph message received by the honourable member for St. John's East in connection with the Bay de Verde campaign depends to a very large extent upon the

sender of the message. Does the honourable member for St. John's East make this charge on his own account, depending upon the reliability of the person who sent the telegraph message as his justification?

MR. HIGGINS:—The person who sent the message was a reliable person. I have quoted that portion of the message which related to the incident. There were other portions of the message which were private.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—As Mr. Higgins makes the charge himself and states that he makes it on the basis of a telegraph message received from a reliable party, I assure the honourable member that I will have the matter investigated. I would point out, however, that telegraph messages, particularly messages in connection with the Bay de Verde election campaign, cannot as a rule be relied upon. I myself had an experience in the district last week. On Saturday evening I was at Bay de Verde. I received a telegraph message during the afternoon saying that on Saturday morning I had to fly for my life from Freshwater. I consequently changed my plans and arranged to go to Freshwater for a meeting on Monday night. I got there on Monday about noon, and on Monday night I had a meeting there which was probably the finest political meeting ever held in Freshwater. It was just as large and enthusiastic a meeting for Freshwater as was any of our meetings in the Majestic Theatre for St. John's. At that meeting I referred to the telegraph message which I had received which said that a man named Butt of Freshwater had sent a message to Mr. J. C. Puddester, at Western Bay, which message Mr. Puddester was circulating, to the effect that on Saturday I had to fly for my life from Freshwater, and called the attention of the audience to the fact that they were residents of Freshwater, they knew that I had passed through the town that morning, that I had been in Freshwater all afternoon and they were now at a meeting at which I was addressing them, and asked them whether they stood for such conduct. The message was signed "Butt" and I consequently am not absolutely sure as to who sent the message, but I am informed that it was sent by a man named James N. Butt, who made himself responsible for this lying statement. Such a man is a disgrace to the locality in which he lives, and I have no doubt the people of Freshwater will drive him out of their town for such improper conduct. It is quite probable that this message to which the honourable member for St. John's East has referred is from an equally irresponsible person and is of a like false character. I shall, however, be glad to have the matter investigated.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the amendments made by the Legislative Council in and upon the Bill sent up entitled "An Act Respecting Certificates of Masters and Mates," were read a second time and concurred in, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the said amendment had been agreed to without amendment.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—These amendments are important in that they improve the Act and extend its operation to the 30th of June, 1921. They are not, however, major amendments, nor do they in any way affect the principle of operation of the measures, but rather improve it. Under section 1 of the Bill the Board of Examiners is appointed, consisting of three persons. The first amendment provides that two shall form a quorum for the transaction of business. Section 2 of the Bill provides that the Board may make certain regulations and the amendment provides that these rules and regulations shall become and

have the full force and effect of law on approval by His Excellency the Governor in Council and publication in the Royal Gazette. The third amendment relates to Section 4 which section provides that the Board shall remain in existence and have power until the first of January, 1921, and no longer. The amendment extends the time to the 30th of June, 1921. I move that these amendments be now read a first time.

Committee of the Whole on Supply.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Chairman, before proceeding with the Estimates, might I ask the Hon. Minister of Finance if it is his intention to table the interim reports of the Commission on Civil Servants' salaries already asked for.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—I haven't seen any reports.

M. HIGGINS:—Being in charge of the Estimates, I naturally thought that you would also have control of these reports.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—I do not know anything about them.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—On yesterday I replied to the question asked on that point and stated that no final report had been received from the Commission but that certain interim reports were in the hands of the Government, which being of a private nature cannot be tabled as it would not be in the interests of certain officials to do so. A digest of these reports which will be of an official nature, has been delayed owing to the absence from the Colony of the Chairman of the Commission who, as you know, is the Auditor General and so far as the interim reports are concerned, the other two commissioners, Messrs. O'Rielly and Christian, are not prepared to accept the responsibility of having them made public.

MR. HIGGINS:—The reason of my asking that the reports in question be tabled arises out of the Prime Minister's reply yesterday to the effect that upon the interim reports submitted and upon the recommendations of the Commission made therein, the great bulk of the increases shown in the Estimates were based.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSOMS:—Some of the increases it was said.

MR. HIGGINS:—Whether there were some or a great many, the position of this House is the same. The reports are not confidential, they are the property of this House as are the Estimates themselves. No report of this character can be private and that is what prompts me to say that not alone is it improper but exceedingly strange that if the estimates are based upon the recommendations of a commission appointed to look into the matter of Civil Servants salaries, we are asked to pass these estimates without the report of the Commission being laid before the House. The position is such that it is not a matter for the Prime Minister to say that some official may be hurt if these reports are made public; certain salaries are to be voted and there are differences here that we cannot account for and therefore it is not a question of the Government's saving any officials from the comment which might arise as a result of the report of the Commission. I think, sir, that under the circumstances, it would be improper for us to consider these Estimates further until the reports we have asked for are in our hands because if it is a case of some department being inefficiently staffed for example, it is not for us to allow such a state of affairs to be hushed up but rather to ventilate it as fully as possible otherwise we are allowing a position to exist that is extraordinary and irreconcilable. We are merely asking for the report of a Commission ap-

pointed and paid for by the people whose money we are going to vote away, and in the light of this aspect of the case I submit that the Government, with all respect, has no right to ask hon. members to regard this report or any part of it confidential or private.

Such a report is not and cannot be confidential. There is no such thing as a confidential report of a Commission appointed by the public service, and paid for out of the public funds. I go further and say that to the best of my ability I will see that that report comes down. If it be the intention to cloak up something and save the feelings of somebody then I think I can find a means of getting the report down. This is the first time in the history of this chamber that this report was not tabled before any discussion was made on the Estimates. Nothing is private to the Government except in the case where mutiny is expected in government departments. Is the report of such a character that it will cause a mutiny in any of the public departments. There is no excuse for denying the House the privilege of reading these reports and I ask the Prime Minister if he would consent to rising the Committee until this can be done.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Chairman, I feel that I have been misunderstood in what I have said. I did not say that there would be no report. In so far as the Estimates are concerned the reports will be furnished. As regards the interim reports on the whole there has been no opportunity to consider them. The Chairman of the Commission has been out of the country and the two remaining members do not feel that they could shoulder the responsibility of giving the reports. They are both new men on the job but in so far as the Estimates are concerned the information will be tabled.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that we get through some of the formal parts of the Estimates. Take, for instance, Pensions, that is not touched by the Civil Service Report.

MR. HIGGINS:—I would suggest to the Hon. the Minister of Justice that I think it would be better for the Committee to rise, as I am sure that it will facilitate matters. You may get through one or two of the votes this afternoon, but what is the use of that.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Members on this side of the House are anxious that the House should close as early as possible. If the Committee rises, it looks like if we were throwing away an afternoon when we could be discussing some of the votes.

MR. HIGGINS:—I understood the Leader of the Government to say that the Committee would rise.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I was not under that impression, because when I came back to my seat the Prime Minister suggested that we should take up the matter of Pensions.

MR. HIGGINS:—If you want to feel that you have made a start in the Estimates you may get through one or two of the votes this afternoon, but there won't be much advantage in that, and I think that it would be better for the Committee to rise, and give us a chance to look over those reports before going any further.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Chairman, so that Mr. Higgins may have the opportunity of studying these reports over night, I move that the Committee rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

The Hon. Minister of Justice moved the House into a Committee on the Terra Nova Sulphite Co. Act.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of the Committee.

MR . CHAIRMAN:—Before this clause goes through I would like to ask

the introducer of the Bill if he has had any information from the Terra Nova Sulphite Co. as to what horse power they intend to develop.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—They did give me a figure, but I have forgotten it. If you have any idea of what the figure might be, and would tell me, it might help me to remember the actual figure. I know that the figure is based upon the one charged in Ontario, and Quebec. It's about the average figure. What horse power have they in Grand Falls?

MR. SULLIVAN:—Fifty thousand horse power.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I think this company's will be about three or four thousand horse power.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Just one word before the adjournment of this House. In reading down the articles in The Evening Advocate reference I see is made to salt. Is it the intention of the Government to charge the fishermen eight dollars per hogshead on the salt imported from St. Pierre by the S.S. Terra Nova and also is it the intention of the Government to charge six or seven dollars per hogshead for salt that is coming from Liverpool at the present time. If that is so there is not much to look forward to for the man who uses salt. The fishermen will certainly have to pay nine or ten dollars for salt during the present summer. I notice here in The Advocate the following (read). Well salt landed here at St. John's and sold to the planters will certainly incur the further cost of at least fifteen per cent on account of freight and profit. Salt today going from St. John's to Labrador will cost a cople of dollars more so I would like to ask the Leader of the Government if it is the intention of the Government to pay the difference between four dollars and eight dollars on the cargo of salt coming from Liverpool and on the cargo arrived from St. Pierre. The set price to-day is four dollars per hogshead for salt which every man North, East, South and West is going to use and we have to add to the first cost of it one dollar at least. I might also state that at present in St. John's there is not a hogshead to be had. I was along the waterfront this morning at eight o'clock and there are vessels down there tied to the wharves waiting for salt. We have nothing to secure the getting of salt for these people. If the ship which has left Liverpool strikes an iceberg where are we? Has any enquiry been made in Nova Scotia for salt? There is considerable salt at Halifax. This is no laughing matter especially as far as the fishermen are concerned. This is the most serious thing before the House at the present time and it needs our careful consideration and in doing that we have a lot to do. Here we are nearing the 1st July and a great number of vessels tied to the wharves in the harbour here with no salt to give them and there is a statement made in one of the Government's prominent papers to lower the fishermen down, to break it gently that the price of salt from now to the last of August will be from eight to ten dollars per hogshead. This is mere camouflage trying to blame the merchants of Water Street for this. It was the province of the merchants to look after the salt question. During the period of the War the salt question was carefully watched from season to season and early in the winter months arrangements were made by the late Government to have salt on the move early in May. Go back and look up your diaries and you will see that salt arrived promptly and we had two or three cargoes here in the month of May in the years from 1917 to 1919. If this is the situation, no doubt it is, the Finance Minister in bringing down the Estimates was wrong when he said there would be an increase of two mil-

lion dollars. The increase will be something like two and one quarter million dollars when we have to pay on twenty or thirty thousand tons of salt five dollars per hogshead so as to give it to the fishermen for four dollars per hogshead. We know in the House and out of it that the trap voyage is over the end of July. The trap voyage is the principal voyage along the South Coast, the Northern Bays and Labrador. If we haven't any salt we are going to be in Queer Street. We ought immediately get in touch with Lunenburg and Halifax. There is a quantity of salt at Halifax, but I am not sure that it is for sale. We should get the sealing steamers that are in the harbour and dispatch them to Halifax if any salt can be obtained there. The salt situation is a very serious one, and no time should be lost in trying to remedy it.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:— The situation in connection with salt is that there are 11,000 tons of salt expected to arrive within the course of the next two weeks. A large quantity is due between Wednesday and Tuesday of this week. The steamer "Isis" chartered by the Newfoundland Government some little time ago left Liverpool on the 12th with a cargo of 6,000 tons of salt. A quantity of salt has already been received from St. Pierre. The seriousness of the salt situation is not a matter for which either the salt importers or the Government is in any way responsible. Last autumn the Acting Minister of Shipping approached certain salt importers on the matter of a supply of salt for this season's fishery and was informed that they were making arrangements for a full supply. During the winter they were again approached by the Acting Min. of Shipping who was assured that arrangements had been made so that a full supply of salt could be secured. There is no question about the fact that everything that could be done from a business standpoint was done. It is a matter of public knowledge that a very large supply of salt would have been in port some weeks ago were it not for the strike at Cadiz. The House has already been informed that four steamers having a total capacity of about 28,000 tons have been detained in Cadiz for a month owing to the strike. That strike was not a matter which could be anticipated by either the fish merchants or by the Government, and in spite of anything the Opposition may say to the contrary neither the fish merchants nor the Government were responsible for the organization of the strike or in any way identified with the delay of the ships because of the strike. I realize the fact that as there is a bye-election pending in the electoral district of Bay de Verde the Leader of the Opposition will accuse the Government of having promulgaged this strike for the express purpose of delaying the salt for fishery purposes, but no person except an enthusiastic supporter of Sir Michael Cashin would give credence to any such story. With respect to the price of salt, the standard price of $4.00 per hogshead for Cadiz salt has been determined upon by the Government. The Cadiz salt imported from St. Pierre cost as high as $8.00 per hogshead; the Liverpool salt imported from Liverpool cost about $6.00 per hogshead; the salt which will ultimately be secured from Cadiz will be very much cheaper. The intention of the Government is to pool all the salt and establish a uniform cash price on the basis of $4.00 Cadiz salt. Liverpool salt being about one dollar per hogshead higher than Cadiz salt. That will mean that the Government will have to help out the fishermen of the country to an amount which is estimated at $50,000 on salt supply for the season's fishery

unless subsequent cargoes can be secured from Cadiz at a cheap figure.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Speaker, before this House adjourns I would like to bring the attention of the Prime Minister and the Government generally to the fact that in conversation with Mr. Bartlett a day or two ago I was informed that some 800 patients are unable to get admission to the hospital. Three or four of my constituents after staying here two or three weeks in boarding houses waiting to get into the hospital had to return home. I would like to know if anything is going to be done about this matter. We cannot estimate the value of a human life, yet we are treating it as if the matter was not worth consideration. There is no provision for this in the estimates; there is no provision for any outport hospitals or any addition to the city general hospital. I merely bring this matter to the attention of the Government now so that the matter may be attended to as early as possible.

Mr. Walsh gave notice of question.

HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—Mr. Speaker, with respect to the salt situation I would like to say a half dozen words. It is certainly to be regretted that there is a shortage of salt, but certainly neither the Government or the merchants are to blame. The strike in Cadiz is to blame. So far as the price is concerned I don't think even $6.00 would frighten the people in White Bay. They had to pay $8.00 last year for salt in White Bay.

On motion the House adjourned until 3 of the clock on to-morrow.

FRIDAY, June 18th, 1920.

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

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Speaker, I have here a petition from the St. John's Municipal Council dealing with legislation now before this House and as the petition is a short one I shall read it for the benefit of hon. members. (Reads petition). I would like to say that this petition is of such a nature that in my opinion, it would be worth while for the Government to consider the matter referred to in it before proceeding further with the Bill now before the House. What is best in the interests of the public is what the Government must feel bound to do. There is a great deal of force behind the request in this petition and I think it should be acceded to because it cannot take from the request of those behind the other measure. That means an indemnity of 5% and if we can give that guarantee to one there is no reason why we cannot give it to the other. I fear, however, as I pointed out a day or two ago that we are not going to accomplish very much in this way with regard to relieving a situation which has become not only accute but painful to those who are in a position to know just what conditions are. It is difficult to make those who are not in the way of becoming acquainted with the actual facts understand the seriousness of the present position with regard to housing. There are hundreds and hundreds of hard working and reputable mechanics and others, who on account of houses having changed ownership, are absolutely without homes. Only the other day a reputable engineer came to me and told me he had notice to quit the house he was in and his situation was actually so desperate that he wanted to know if I could tell him of some person who might have a vacant lot of land where they would allow him to pitch a tent. Now this story is almost unbelievable but conditions are really as bad as that in the city to-day. There are altogether too few houses to cope with the growth of the city. I would ask in presenting this petition that the best possible consideration be given to the request

therein. I think there is a very great deal of justice behind it and by granting it nothing can be taken from the other proposition but rather will it add to it and with that consideration in mind, I would ask for it the Government's support.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—I would like to ask the hon. member if it is his desire that we take the duty of all materials that a man needs for the building of his house and if he expects that the duty on all hardware to be used is to be refunded.

MR. HIGGINS:—I take it that there has been universal concessions of free admission of materials and that here things needed and imported will be granted a rebate.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—If every individual would have to get a rebate on all things that he needed for use in building his house and bought locally I think that it would be an awful undertaking to control.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—

Mr. Chairman, I don't see where this petition effects this bill at this stage in the committee. A great many men are ready to sacrifice their capital and put money into this undertaking out of purely philanthrophic spirit. The independent citizen wants to help out the poor man, the class of man that Mr. Bennett referred to yesterday. If philanthrophic men give their time and money we will encourage them. They don't plan to make on the rent they charge as much as 5%. It is not a private investment.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—Is it a charitable proposition, if so why not let the few men who have their money in it on the 5% basis take it out and let the Government put in the promised $60,000.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I understand that my hon. friend is one of the shareholders in that company. I am also a shareholder. The proposition that now forms part of this bill is what the company has asked for and all it has asked for.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—I gave my subscription in a public spirited manner. I was asked to contribute for five or six years and I am ready and willing to let them have it without any interest. When I gave the money I didn't care if I ever got it back again. I think that those generous men who have placed their money there can afford to let it stay there without any interest and the Government could do what I proposed.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Will you move that this section be stricken out speaking on behalf of the company.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—Yes I will move that it be stricken out.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, the Bill with respect to the Dominion Cooperative Building Society relates only to the activities of that particular combination which is a philanthropic organization; it does not relate to any general movement which may be made throughout the Island of Newfoundland for the building of houses for the accommodation of the people of Newfoundland. Any such proposition would receive the consideration of the House separately and distinctly from the present measure. I consequently do not feel that the Committee Stage of the present Housing Bill should be deferred because of the presentation of this petition, nor do I feel that any general provisions should be inserted in this Bill. This Bill has one object, and one object only, and that is, to put into Legislative effect the pledge which I gave the promoters of the Company in the matter of free entry for building material not procurable in Newfoundland and a guarantee of a dividend not exceeding five per cent, the Government having sufficient

representation on the Board of Directors to see that the affairs of the Company are properly managed and that rentals were fixed on a five per cent dividend basis. A very large proportion of the investors of this Company seek no dividend. As it is, all the investors may be donating their capital because this Bill does not guarantee capital. But the Company asked for two concessions. These two concessions are granted by this measure. That was the pledge which I gave, and that pledge is being carried out to the fullest. So that there can be no misunderstanding in this connection I will read a letter from Hon. M. P. Gibbs, solicitor for the company, asking for the concessions, my letter in reply, and a second letter from him to myself. A perusal of this correspondence in conjunction with this Bill will satisfy the House that the requests that the company made are being fully carried out. The following is the correspondence:

Gibbs & Barron,
St. John's, Newfoundland,
May 26th, 1920.

(Copy)

Hon. R. A. Squires, K.C.,
Premier.

Dear Sir,

We are directed by the Dominion Co-operative Association, Limited, to inform you that the following have been elected Directors of the Company: Hons. J. D. Ryan, M. G. Winter, J. Anderson, J. McGrath, Esq., E. Bowring, Esq., Jas. Parker, Esq., Harold MacPherson, Esq., Dr. Brehm and Lieut. Col. Bernard. Bankers: The Royal Bank of Canada. Auditors: G. N. Read Son & Watson, and our Mr. Gibbs, Solicitor for the Association.

The Association would like your Government to have legislation enacted the present session of the Legislature, whereby:

(1) Interest to an amount not exceeding 5% be guaranteed by the Government upon Bonds of the Company. The Government shall only be called upon to guarantee interest upon bonds provided the par value of the Bonds so guaranteed shall not exceed the cash capital actually subscribed for and paid into the Treasury of the Company. The Bonds to be redeemable in twenty years.

(2) The cost of workingmen's homes to be no greater than $2,500 each.

(3) Materials that cannot be produced in the country and to be used in the construction of workingmen's homes, to be admitted free of duty. If said materials be purchasable locally, the Government to allow a rebate of duties.

(4) The Government to advance by way of Loan to the Company the sum of $50,000 to be repaid to the Government by the Association, when the said sum of $50,000 shall be paid into the Treasury of the Company by the Shareholders thereof.

Yours truly,
(Signed) GIBBS & BARRON.

(Copy)

May 29th, 1920.

Gentlemen:

I have your letter of the 26th referring to the Dominion Co-operative Association, Ltd.

Before the Government would be prepared to make a cash loan to the Company or guarantee interest on bonds it would be necessary for arrangements to be made under which the Government would be suitably represented upon the Board of Directors. It would also be necessary for me to have for submission to Council a share list showing the names of the shareholders and the amount for which they have subscribed.

I would be glad to have this infor-

mation at the earliest possible moment.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) R. A. SQUIRES,

Prime Minister.

Messrs. Gibbs & Barron,

City.

(Copy)

Gibbs & Barron,

St. John's, Nfld.,

June 1st, 1920.

Hon. R. A. Squires, K.C.,

Premier.

Dear Sir:

We have your favour of the 29th ult., re Dominion Co-operative Association, Ltd., and note what you say.

The Association will be pleased that the Government have representation upon the Board of Directors and is prepared to carry out any reasonable recommendation that the Government may make or suggest in that behalf. Enclosed please find copy of share list showing the names of Shareholders. There has been no attempt made by personal solicitation to induce people to subscribe to the capital stock of the Company, because it was not thought desirable until the Company was in a position to definitely state the concessions which the Government had given.

We beg to suggest for your consideration that instead of a guarantee of interest on bonds that the Government agree to guarantee to the shareholders of the Company for a specific number of years any sum on which the net value dividends of the Company shall be less than five per cent, upon the actual cash capital paid upon the share subscribed for and allotted.

Yours truly,

(Signed) GIBBS & BARRON.

Share list of the Dominion Co-operative Building Association, Limited:

Names	Shares
E. P. Roche	10
James Parker	10
Eric Bowring	100
F. Morris	5
H. Anderson	5
A. McPherson	10
James McKay	10
Dugald Munn	10
Robert A. Templeton	10
M. P. Gibbs	5
John Anderson	10
C. A. Pippy	2
Harold Mitchell	10
R. K. Bishop	5
H. E. Cowan	10
J. D. Ryan	5
E. H. Ershler	5
Thomas Soper	5
W. P. Shortall	2
James J. McGrath	5
J. M. Devine	5
J. M. Spearns	5
M. G. Winter	10
A. J. Harvey	10
Jonas Barter	1
Llewelyn White	2
Harold McPherson	10
Thomas C. Noel	1

In the matter of loan, I have since the receipt of the first letter from Mr. Gibbs received a letter from the Hon. John Anderson stating the amount of the advance which they require to be $25,000 and not $50,000 as stated in the first letter. That advance of $25,000 will be arranged for. It will be a credit established with the company's bankers, the Royal Bank of Canada, against which would be paid into the bank the amount for which the various share-holders have pledged themselves. There will be no loss to the Government and no loss to the Company in that connection. It is merely a matter of providing temporary credit so that this spring's supplies of materials may be paid for and payment made promptly, the credit lasting while the company is getting in its first call on shares.

This housing proposition is not a matter for which the Government takes credit; the entire credit has to be given to the Hon. John Anderson, the Hon. M. P. Gibbs and Mr. James McGrath,

the former President of the Longshoremen's Union. I do not agree with the view which has been expressed by Mr. Higgins and also by Mr. Vinnicombe, two members for St. John's East, that it is improper to give this company free entry for building materials. This is not a case in which the Company is going into stores on Water Street, buying goods and then asking the Customs to give a refund on the articles purchased. This is a case in which the Company will import from abroad the supplies which are required in quantities sufficient to meet their demands. The invoices will be presented, and, by virtue of this Bill, the Finance Minister will be authorized to let the goods come in on free entry. If it were a case of a company constructing houses for commercial purposes or a private individual building houses for his own investment purposes, it would be a different matter. No building company or private individual would for one moment consider the investment of capital in houses on a five per cent profit basis. This proposition is not one that appeals to any person who wishes to invest money purely from the standpoint of an investor who wants to make sure of a satisfactory annual return for his capital. The houses to be built by this company are to be built in the interests of the poorest class of the community. The object of the company, in so far as it has been explained to me, is to build say thirty houses and then go to some slum section and take thirty families out of that slum section and put them into these houses and clean up that slum section, build thirty houses there and take thirty families from some other section and put them into the section they have cleaned up, and so on year by year, to clean up the slums of the city. This is not a housing proposition which brings the company in competition with any other building company or private investor. Houses will be provided at a rate of rent to suit the families of the class of people who now live in slum sections and who cannot afford to occupy decent tenements. This is a case in which the Government is helping this company as a public philanthropic concern in the same way as it would help a hospital, subscribe to the upkeep of a park or provide for improved sanitary conditions in an unhealthy locality. The object of the company is to help to clean up the slums of the city, and by so doing improve housing conditions for the poorest classes of the community and to provide decent homes for a class of people whose earning ability is not sufficient to pay house rent for a good house. The objects of the company as I understand them are not merely to provide additional homes; in fact the company will not be providing additional homes, because it will not carry out the mission for which it is intended as the objects of the company have been explained to me if it does not tear down the filthy rookeries in which people are now living and replace them by respectable tenements; that will not be increasing housing accommodation, it will be improving housing accommodation. The honourable member stated that this company will be in competition with the St. John's Municipal Council or any building company or private investor who desires to undertake the erection of houses and provide more housing accommodation for the city and to erect houses to be sold to people who are financially able to purchase or rent to people who are able to pay full rent. What I would like to see is the erection during the summer of say thirty houses in some good locality. I would like to see the company go to any of the dirty, miserable sections of the town where people are living in filth and disorder, take these families from these houses, put them

in clean, decent surroundings, and give them a chance to live, tear down these rookeries and replace them by decent houses. The company will do very little good in this town of St. John's if its object is merely to build houses and rent them cheaply. It must go farther. It must build houses. It must rent them at a figure which the people who live in these slum sections can afford to pay, and then clean up the slums and put decent houses in their places. A day or two ago the honourable member for St. John's West referred to the workmen of St. John's as being a poor class of people, much below the average in independence and income of the outport man of the same class, that the outport man had a comfortable home, had a bit of land and had cattle while the St. John's man of the same class could not afford to pay for a decent tenement in which to live.

Ido not agree with Mr. Bennett. If that were true, instead of the outport people coming to St. John's to better their conditions St. John's people would be going to the outports to better their conditions. If Mr. Bennett feels that there is in St. John's a class of that sort who can do better for themselves in the outports I can indicate to him a score of outports to which these men may go this summer and thrive and prosper in the same way as the outport man thrives and prospers. The housing problem in St. John's is serious in the matter of the shortage of houses. That shortage is due to the high cost of material for the construction of houses, combined with the high cost of labor. Rents must go up in proportion to the increase in cost of building materials, and the increase in the cost of labor, and just so long as these high prices continue will rents be high, and there will be a dearth of houses. But the suggestion made by Mr. Bennett that St. John's, the capital city of this country, is inhabited by a race of paupers who want to depend upon the Government charity for the houses in which they live I entirely disagree with. I feel his remarks are a reflection upon the city, and a libel upon the working classes of the community. The working men of St. John's are just as independent, just as capable of earning a comfortable livelihood for themselves, as the same class of men living in the outports. As a matter of fact, a very large number of them are outport men and if these men find that they cannot make as comfortable a living for themselves in St. John's as they can make in the outports, then there is no question whatever about the fact that they would go back to the outports to improve their condition. I am in entire accord with the ideas of this building company; I am also in entire accord with any program which may be advanced by the honourable members opposite to improve housing conditions in Newfoundland, particlarly housing conditions in St. John's, as the only part of the Island of Newfoundland from which I have heard any complaint as to housing conditions in the town of St. John's. The condition as it exists this year is no worse; in fact, is not as bad as it was last year and the year before. One would look in vain, however, for any attempt being made last year or the year before or the year before that by the honourable member who presented this petition or by any member of the Government of that day to improve conditions, and if it were not for the public spirited activity of the Honourable John Anderson, Hon. Mr. Gibbs, and Mr. James McGrath, and the fact that the Government is anxious to help them out in their enterprise, nothing would be heard of this matter at this session of the Legislature. The attitude of the honourable members for St. John's East, Mr. Higgins and Mr. Vinnicombe, and the honourable member for St. John's West,

Mr. Bennett, is antagonistic to the idea of helping out this company. I am surprised at them. I could quite understand outport representatives who had no immediate interest in this Bill objecting to the pledging of the funds of the Colony for the benefit of the working classes of this city, but I cannot understand these two members for St. John's East attempting to throw any obstacle whatever in the way of a courtesy being extended to this philanthropic organization the object of which is to better housing conditions in St. John's. Housing in St. John's is not a Government proposition; it is a Municipal proposition. The Municipal Council has done nothing or practically nothing; the only evidence of life that the Municipal Council has shown during this session of the Legislature in the matter of housing is this petition presented by Mr. Higgins, member for St. John's East, objecting to the Government's assisting this company to help the poor in the matter of housing. Let the Coty Council get busy and do something for the citizens of the city. When the housing matter was brought before the late Government they decided that it should stand over. When the West End bye election was on Sir Michael Cashin had a conference at his residence with some of the parties interested in housing problems, and made all sorts of promises, but nothing came of it. Just as soon as the Government attempts to do something the Municipal Council wakes up and tries to impede us in our work and the members for St. John's East and Mr. Bennett, member for St. John's West, get busy and try to impede.

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 Preservation of Beavers," and "An Act concerning Former Enemy Aliens," without amendment.

Mr. MacDonnell asked the Prime Minister, in the absence from this House of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines:—(1) If an application of Joseph Kenny for a license to cut timber, or to erect a saw mill in the vicinity of Gull Pond—(near Conception Harbor, in the district of Harbor Main) has been granted. (2) If any protests against such license have been received in the Department of Agriculture and Mines.

Mr. Walsh asked the Hon. Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House all correspondence between deputies of all departments of the Government (or any department which made recommendations) and the Commissioners appointed by the late Government to adjust the salaries of Civil Servants, also all recommendations from deputies of the several departments in relation to increase or otherwise.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act to confirm a Contract on the subject of the Manufacture of Paper Pulp and Wood products" 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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 1p7 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of Companies,'" 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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Cus-

toms the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.

The Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of Committee.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Mr. Speaker, before dealing with the Supply, I would like to make a few comments. I noticed that when the Minister of Finance and Customs introduced his Estimates a few days ago he simply came in and tabled the Estimates and read from the Summary increases under different heads, and simply remarked that the Estimates were not his own estimates. Perhaps he did not say it in those words, but that is what was understood by us as he told us that the Estimates tabled to-day were based on the report of a Commission appointed by the out-going Government to inquire into Civil Service salaries and that that report was received by us, and adopted by us, and that he was merely carrying out the report of that Commission appointed by us. I don't think that he meant to tell the country that these were our Estimates.

I happened to be the Finance Minister of the late Government, and the position was simply this. Last year, as you know, a demand was made on the Government by the Postal Telegraph Department and other departments, and as you remember the Postal Telegraph Department after some communication with the Government, and after some consideration by the Government, were granted the request asked and following that the Government immediately decided to appoint a Commission composed of the Auditor General, Inspector O'Rielly, and his Accountant in that department to go into all the Civil list and report to the Government. That was at midsummer. Since then there has been a General Election, and we all know what has happened. The new Finance Minister comes in and takes charge, and apparently, according to the Estimates tabled but not in accordance to the promises made to his constituents, introduces a Supply Bill here with an increase of two million dollars and tries to tell the House and the country in general that these were the Estimates of their predecessors recommended by Commissioners appointed by them and adopted by them before they went out. That is not the position. Although we appointed those Commissioners to inquire into the salaries of every department and report to the Government we did not pledge ourselves to them, or to the country, or to anybody what our action would be after we received their report, but in the face of that when the Estimates were tabled we were told by the Minister of Finance and Customs that the Estimates were based upon the report of the Commissioners. We asked for the report of the Commissioners and were told by the Prime Minister that the report could not or would not be tabled. On further inquiry we find that the Commissioners have not reported in full at all, that the report was only piece-meal, and that the Estimates are not based upon that report or on any part of it. The Estimates are based upon a political vote and brought in here by the Minister and handed to the country, not upon the lines that we hoped that they would be, of a full report of the Commissioners paying salaries, deserving salaries, to each and every official in the different departments. Here we are to-day faced in the Estimates with an increase of practically two million dollars. Well, now, I would like to remind the Minister of Finance and Customs, and the Prime Minister, that these Estimates are not in keeping with the Manifesto handed to the people of the country by the Prime Minister when seeking election to the House last year; these Estimates to the ordinary outsider and cer-

tainly to the ordinary politician, after looking through them, make the whole thing look like a wreck, make them feel that the whole country will be a wreck. Well, I am credited with knowing what a wreck means, and this looks more like a wreck to me than anything that I have seen for many years. We were held up to ridicule and criticism by our opponents before the General Election last year and in the face of that the present Government have the temerity to come in here and ask the House to vote an increase of nearly $2,000,000 and table these Estimates and defend themselves before the country. Read them down and what do you find. Every salary, every large salary is increased not with regard or in accordance with any report made by the Commissioners. Now what is the meaning of it? The Minister should when he came here yesterday have tabled the Estimates and given us in detail the increases and the cause for each one, but he had not the courage to name each estimate and tell why there is an increase of two million dollars. Now we are asked to come in here and pass them without consideration. Take the first estimate. I will ask the Minister now why he has increased the first estimate 125,000 dollars.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUCTOMS:—Because of New York Exchange.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Exchange has nothing to do with it. What about the London drop and the gain there? Put the debt to Europe at thirty million dollars, and the debt to New York at eleven million dollars. The gain on the London exchange more than offsets the loss on New York Exchange last year, and if that is so why vote an amount of one hundred and twelve or one hundred and fifteen thousand dollars for that purpose? That is not the way to make up Estimates. How do you know what the New York Exchange will be next year? Time enough to vote that money if you find that you need it within the next six months, but as I have already stated the difference in London should give us a good sum to our credit on the other side of the books.

We find the vote of Civil Government increased $272,582.72. What is the explanation? You gave us no explanation. Now is that in keeping with the Manifesto of your leader when you told this country that you were going to reduce expenditure and reduce taxation. You never made any attempt to justify it. Here are a few things that the Prime Minister mentioned in his Manifesto that he did not carry out and never intended to carry out: (Reads extracts from Manifesto.)

These are a couple of paragraphs from the Manifesto of the Prime Minister, but before going into the Estimates fully in connection with the Estimates, I would like to draw the attention of the Prime Minister as well as the Finance Minister to the fact that last fall, before the elections and after the elections, the Government of to-day said in their own papers that they were going to have myself and my associates behind prison bars. This is the kind of stuff that was handed out to the people of the country to read and digest. Within the past eight months you have prostituted every department in the hope of trying to secure evidence against us, and your efforts have all gone against us in your papers and otherwise, but where are the proofs. The House of Assembly has now been in session two months and we have not yet heard of a single bit of evidence to prove that we acted false to the people of the country. According to the prostitutions you made of the Government Departments and according to the charges you made in your own papers, you did not propose that we should be here to-day. But where are your

proofs, and why are we here to-day? You ought to get up to-day and apologise to us, at least, for the many charges that you made and which you could not substantiate. Nothing was too low, mean and contemptible for you to do. You brought Auditors from the United States and gave them a free hand to open up every public institution in the country. While these gentlemen were investigating, the Government were shouting that Cashin and his associates were going to be put behind prison bars. The Government simply turned out the Auditor General and turned these gentlemen loose on the different departments. Now what has happened. These gentlemen have been here and gone and we have been in session two months and the Government have not brought forward one particle of Legislation that will be for the betterment of this Colony. There was never a Government in that had less to its credit than the present Government. I want to tell the Finance Minister and the Prime Minister, as the two principal members of the Government, face to face, that I do not care a jot for the charges that they made against me. I hope that the Finance Minister will leave that office with the same record and with the same recommendation as I did after eleven years. The majority of my countrymen feel the same about it. The charges made against me and my colleagues by the Finance Minister and the Prime Minister are now dropped and we are meeting with that reward at the hands of our fellow countrymen that men of proper calibre always meet, viz.: confidence and approbation for our past record. I served my country as Finance Minister for ten years and eleven months and I care not for any statement that can be made by the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister, who have descended to the lowest and vilest means to try and degrade me. But the tables are turned to-day and when we go into the details of the Estimates, I may have an opportunity of asking them why they made those charges against me. Why do you not table the report of the Commission that was appointed to enquire into the salaries of the Civil Service? The reason is that the report do not suit you. If the Government is honest and if they are sincere why not come out and tell the whole story.

I am prepared as I already stated to defend anything you will bring down in this House. I care naught for any man in this House as far as my actions in the Finance Department are concerned. But I want to remind you gentlemen that day in and day out you have vilified me and vilified my associates, you have brought down detectives from the United States as well as accountants to open up every department. You have prostituted every department. The Finance Minister handed out the information in the bye-election in St. John's West last fall to the Squires' paper but it could not be substantiated. It was done by Brownrigg as it could not come from anybody else. He handed it out to the public of this Colony and after being two months in this House you have not brought down in this House what you told the public you would. Thank God I am on this side of the House. I say thank God I prefer to be on this side of the House and not on the other side and be a half-criminal. You are not prepared to get up here and talk like I am this evening. That is how I feel about it. Now you come down here after this deceit and turmoil of six months and present to the Colony the Estimates containing an increase of two millions of dollars. Every one of importance in the Civil Service has had his salary increased. But as far as the people are concerned what do those Estimates show? Not one cent for old age pen-

sions—not one cent for the relief of the poor. But the salary of the Finance Minister has been increased to eight thousand dollars with pickings. The Prime Minister has increased his salary thousands of dollars and as far as I know his salary will be in the vicinity of twelve or fifteen thousand dollars per year. Each and every other individual who has a seat in this House gets a thousand dollars per year. Legislature alone this year will require a vote of thirty thousand dollars more than ever before. Why come down here and ask this House to vote one thousand dollars to each and every member of this House for sitting here? Why should you have a seat in this House at all if the Government is not prepared to come in here and do business? Why not proceed with the affairs of the Colony in four weeks, here we are nearing the end of June and nothing of importance done. Mr. Jennings need not laugh. He ought to be over here trying to do some good for the country and not looking from behind Government benches. You would be here but for the fat job you have. You would be away in the herring fishery. You would be on this side endorsing what I am saying that is if you were the honest man you are supposed to be. I suppose you are human like the rest of us. That is the position. Why should you be here receiving five thousand dollars? Why should this Colony pay you one thousand dollars for three months work? Talk about the business of this House; you know what business has been done up to the present time. What have they done in fulfilment of their promises to the people of St. John's West during the bye-election last fall? The House may be open for another week or another month, the Estimates are very late in coming down and we are told the Budget Speech will be delivered in a few days. There has been no serious legislation brought in this House, no measure except the Fishery Rules by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. No member on the other side has brought in any worth while legislation of any kind. There have been introduced a few bills simply to change the verbiage of existing legislation. You will find on the several order papers not one bill of any importance except the Fishery Rules brought before this House. And these are questionable. Not one measure of any kind has been introduced by any member on the other side from the Prime Minister down. This man's fancy promises last fall when he was seeking his election in St. John's West have been unperformed and the people of that constituency have been looking forward to a great many things to come from this Government. The conditions of the Colony are worse than ever before . Every paragraph of the manifesto if you read it down the same as I do is ancient history. No legislation of any kind has been introduced by them. To substantiate this I may say that this afternoon a petition was presented by my colleague the honourable member for St. John's East on behalf of the Municipal Council asking for free entry on all material imported for the purpose of building poor man's houses. What is his position to-day as compared with January last? To-day he has brought in legislation to guarantee five per centum per annum on all money offered by charitable persons to build houses here in St. John's for the poor. What induced those people to give that money to the poor people of St. John's? Is not great credit due those who have taken this up on themselves, to Sir Edgar Bowring and Hon. J. D. Ryan and others who have given this money for a philanthropic purpose and who have considered the great want and hardship which the people are to-day experiencing? If the Government are not prepared to do some-

thing they nevertheless call it a charitable act. I repeat that statement in this House. I call this charitable money. These men deserve credit and further they do not care when they get it back. We hear no question of the Prime Minister or Mr. Brownrigg fulfiling their promises as to the housing scheme, we do not see them bringing in that great measure before this House so that houses will be erected for the workingmen of St. John's East and West; to accommodate the poor people who are sleeping five and six in a bed, and to accommodate those who have not to-day a roof over their heads. We are told this afternoon by the Minister of Finance that down in the basement of the Custom House there is a family, a number of children and a man and a wife I take it who have no shelter and no place to lay their heads and still the Finance Minister comes in here with the Estimates containing an increase of two million dollars over last year in answer to his promise to the electors who sent him here, to protect their interests and to erect houses in galore. The Government ought to bring in legislation according to their promises made last fall in the bye-election. The members on this side of the House will vote for it. What does it mean? I will take one item in the Estimates, the salaries given the members of this House and the Upper House. The increase in that direction is thirty thousand dollars. That thirty thousand dollars will go to the rich men of the Upper House and rich men of the city still the Finance Minister when he presents the Estimates has no provision made in them for the fulfilment of the promises that they made last fall to the working people of St. John's that one of the first things the Government would do would be the bringing in before this House legislation to provide for the housing scheme in the East and West of St. John's. Here in the last stages of this session of this Assembly as I have already stated no proposition of any consequence has been brought before this House. If they were in earnest last fall would they not bring in that proposition now? If you bring in such a measure we on the Opposition side of the House will forfeit our claim to the thirty thousand dollars which has been foisted upon us. If you take this thirty thousand dollars it will go down in history for years and years without being changed. No Government will take the trouble of reducing salaries and it was never done for the thirty years I have been here except a certain entrenchment under Sir Robert Bond's administration. Put this amount to the credit of the housing scheme and it will meet all the requirements. It will pay 6% on a half million dollar loan. Do not take the whole half million in the first year but spread it over a period of six years and build sufficient houses for the poor of this city and have enough to accommodate all. With that thirty thousand you can borrow a half million dollars right here in the city at six per centum per annum. You need not borrow it all now to try and prove to the people of this city at least to those in whom you are interested that you are in earnest. The one thing of any consequence that has been done is to pass the fish regulations as I have already said.

I heard a story once about the Prime Minister of this Colony, the present Prime Minister. I heard he had a dream, and in that dream he was going to be Prime Minister of the Colony. So far his dream has come true. But he dreamt also that the country was going into Confederation with Canada in two or three years. He then ran for Prime Minister of Canada and was elected. I do not know, sir, if it is correct that you had that dream, but it looks as if it were true not only that

you had the dream but that the dream might come true. If you continue in political life for 25 years you will undoubtedly find yourself in Canada, and you will find this Colony in Canada.

You have come in here with estimates \$2,000,000 more than last year, and next year they will be \$2,000,000 more than this year. If you are going to pay back out of the revenue of this Colony \$4.00 on every hogshead of salt it will cost the Colony \$200,000 for this one item. And how many other things are there for which no provision has been made. There is the matter of the coastal boats, and the railroad, which I understand you intend taking up when the House closes. If that continues there is no reason why you will not land this country into Confederation with Canada, politics or not. But to get away from the dream. I want to remind you that your conduct will not pass without my criticism as a representative of the people, I am here to look after the interests of the people.

With respect to the coastal boats you have been asked for a statement of the coastal boats Portia and Prospero since they were taken over by the Government. That was asked for several weeks ago and it is not yet forthcoming. Take the coastal boat Portia that has been on dock three months already. She is there with the bottom out of her, with full crew under pay and fifty or sixty tradesmen working on her. I am not questioning what she is going to cost the Colony, but the whole management of the coastal boats has been inefficient and wasteful. Look at your manifesto, read it down. What are you going to do about the railroads? Where are all the great things that we were going to get from the new government? In your manifesto you compared the owner of the railroad with the owner of a house; if the house is not kept in repair it goes down. But you have not made a single effort to improve the railroad, you haven't touched it, and people are going out on the railroad every day at the risk of their lives. It isn't because you haven't got the money. We left \$3,000,000 in the treasury of the Colony. We were told by the Finance Minister during the election that it was frenzied finance, but I want to remind you that that railroad is in the same condition as it was last year and you haven'h made any attempt to remedy it. You are refusing to give any information, and you have brought down no legislation. You know that the people are aroused now. You know that the people in Bay de Verde are awake to the situation. I don't care whether we get our man or get yours. The whole matter of the coastal boats is in a deplorable state. We were told the other day that you had hired a boat for \$60.00 per day. You have to find the crew and everything else. I was up to the dock this morning and saw the Ranger. You should have been up there, sir, or had a representative there. She has gone north to-day. There is a man gone north on her as doctor who can neither read or write. I was told that he is a great friend of Coaker, and he is going down to look after the health of the people on that boat.

I suppose I will be told that I am rambling away from the estimates. But why doesn't the Minister of Finance get up here and explain to the House what each item means, so that it can go to the country through the reporters' box.

While I think of it, I have noticed a proclamation signed by R. A. Squires as Colonial Secretary and headed, Published by Authority. It struck me on reading over that proclamation that the man who signed it did not know or did not consider what he was doing or perhaps it got in unknown to him. It reads as follows:

Upon the recommendation of the Food Control Board, and under the provisions of the Food Control Act, 1917, and the War Measures Act, 1914-1916. His Excellency the Governor in Council has been pleased to approve the following Regulations regarding the sale of Sugar:—

1. The wholesale price of sugar when sold by the importer shall not exceed Twenty-seven and one-quarter cents per pound, when it is a cash transaction.

2. When sugar is sold by Jobbers, the price shall not be in excess of Twenty-eight and one-quarter cents per pound, when it is a cash transaction.

3. For the purpose of this Regulation, Twenty-five barrels or over shall constitute and be deemed a wholesale transaction, and must be taken delivery of at one time. Any less quantity than the above, sold in original package, shall constitute a jobbing transaction. A barrel shall be held to contain not less than three hundred pounds.

4. From and after this date the retail price of white granulated sugar within the Municipal limits of the Town of St. John's shall not exceed thirty cents per pound, and in the outports thirty cents per pound, plus transportation, insurance and other regular charges.

5. Any person who shall offer for sale, or shall sell any sugar at a greater price than that fixed in above Regulations, shall be guilty of a breach thereof.

6. All foregoing prices are for cash sales.

7. No dealer shall refuse a tender of cash when a purchase is male.

8. Any person violating any of the provisions of these Regulations shall be guilty of an offence and liable upon summary conviction before a Magistrate or Justice of the Peace to a penalty not exceeding one thousand dollars, or to imprisonment for a period not exceeding three months, or to both fine and imprisonment. (One half of the fine shall be paid to the informer and the balance to the Food Control Board, for the benefit of the Dominion).

9. No Sugar shall be imported into Newfoundland unless a permit to do so shall have been obtained beforehand from the Food Control Board.

10. These Regulations shall be, and come into effect on the First day of June, 1920.

11. The Regulations respecting Sugar, Flour and Molasses, published in the Royal Gazette on the eighth of October, 1918, are hereby cancelled.

R. A. SQUIRES,
Colonial Secretary.

Dept. of the Colonial Secretary,
June 15, 1920.

Can you see anything wrong with that sir? On first sight it struck me as playing into the hands of a certain class, the wholesale men. Under this regulation the wholesale man can buy sugar one cent cheaper than the smaller man. Now teke the grocer on Middle St. or anywhere else in the city, and how many will you find who are in a position to buy twenty-five barrels of sugar at a time. They cannot do it but men like Mr. Knowling can buy their sugar in big lots and make a cent a pound off it more than the small grocer without touching it. Surely that proclamation was never even looked at by the man who signed his name to it, if he represents a St. John's district. There is no reason why the smaller man should not get the same advantages as the wholesaler. This sugar has to be doled out to the people of this city by the retailers, you know the kind of stores I mean, and how many of them can go down and make an outlay of nearly a thousand dollars for twenty-five barrels which they must do if they are to get the benefit of the cent that is given to the bigger man, and still the man who

signed that is a representative of the district of St. John's West. Surely he will cancel it and I would draw his attention to it particularly so that he may have it changed because if he does not it is nothing less than an imposition on the working men of this city.

I notice that all the salaries of the departmental heads have been increased to $4,000 each and the deputies to $3,600. I would like to know if that has been done on the recommendation of the Commission. We asked for their report but we only got part of it and that was signed by nobody and accompanied by a request from the Government not to make the contents public. Why should the Government ask that this report not be made public? There is one reason for it and it is this: The recommendations embodied in these reports were ignored altogether by them and increases are shown in the Estimates that are not at all justified while other officials who are deserving of consideration have received none. Take the Finance Minister's Department for example, the first accountant has been increased from $1250 to $2000 and the first clerk from $1680 to $2200, that may be all right but we find that the accountant of Old Age Pensions gets no increase whatever. Now to begin with Mr. Woods is as old an official as any man in the Customs and Finance Department, he is painstaking and efficient and further he is an ex-member of the House of Assembly and has been a departmental head and he has a thorough knowledge of affairs inside and outside of this House and not one black mark will be found against him. His duties are by no means easy but he seems to please every one and there are men who have had their salaries doubled who are not fit to be in the same office with him. Mr. Bursell has been increased from $1600 to $2200. I am not in position to say what the Commission said of Mr. Bursell but I know that he is one of the best officials in the Civil Service of Newfoundland. He is always competent and obliging and you will always find him at his office early in the morning and the last to leave there at night. I do not know if his increase was made on the recommendation of the Commission for as I have already stated only part of the report was handed to Mr. Higgins and I have not seen it. As a matter of fact we should not be here at all considering the Estimates till we have the full report. However there must be some mistake about Mr. Woods. Does the Minister of Finance know anything about it?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—I have no information to give you.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—He was getting $1500 and that should have been doubled.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—In my opinion he is getting all he is worth. Any schoolboy could do the work he is doing.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—It is not enough because you say so, that he should have been ignored.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—Do you want me to increase him?

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Yes you ought to do it. His is one of the most important positions in the Colony.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—All he has to do is to sign cheques.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—He has very much more than that to do as you should know.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—He was sick for four months and a stenographer did his work.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—You might be sick yourself yet. This statement is untrue.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—Yes perhaps I would, but what I state is absolutely correct.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Now take the Agricultural Department. The vote for

that department has been increased $58,600. You have not told us anything about that increase. Mr. Bailey, the Secretary of that department, is now receiving a salary of twenty-five hundred dollars. Who is the historian of that department? Mr. Shortis. Well, I would recommend him to write the history of the Woodford Affidavit. I see here that the Government Analyst, Mr. Davies, has received an increase from $2924 to $3800. He is competent and deserves an increase in salary. He has all the qualifications. He was an outsider and he had about seven or eight hundred dollars a year as schoolmaster, before he got this job. He is increased every year. He may be worth the money, but if that department was closed to-morrow, we could do without it. We increased the salary 20%, we gave this last May. You will find in the Estimates of last year, that he received $2400, to-day he is receiving $3800, an increase of $1500 more than last year. This increase is as much as the total salary that Mr. Woods is receiving to-day. There must be a reason for that. Mr. Hutchings in the Marine and Fisheries Department has received $2500 increase, a justifiable increase. He is a worthy, obliging, and competent official. That is the worst I have to say of him in the ten or twelve years I have known him in that department. Who is the Superintendent of Fisheries, a new appointment of $5000. Who is the Superintendent of Marine Instruction, an appointment of $1500.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—Mr. Hawco, the hero.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Has he the qualifications necessary for this salary?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—I presume he has.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—You should know whether he has or not. Minister of Public Works increased from $2592 to $3600. Mr. Harris, the first clerk, increased to $1650, but what is puzzling us is on what basis are you giving these increases. Surely you do not think you can come here with your Estimates, and pass them, without being able to tell on what basis you have given these increases. Don't you think this is an unsual way to bring in Estimates? Don't you intend to give some explanation in going through them? Don't you think you should have given some explanation, before we went into them at all?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—Perhaps so.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Now take the Customs Department. Alexander LeMessurier is now receiving less salary than last year.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—That is not correct. There was no reduction.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Well, he is receiving the same salary. There must be some reason for it. He is cashier in that department. He has received as high as $80,000 a day cash, still, you don't increase his salary, and won't tell us why you didn't.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—There is no reason.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—You did not increase the salary of the Inspector of Customs, and you won't tell why. Do you think that the people of the country will stand for that kind of thing. Why did you increase the salary of the Deputy Minister to $3600. There is no Deputy has a more responsible position than Mr. LeMessurier. He is receiving the whole revenue of the country over the counter, and he must be competent and honest. If he is why did you not treat him as well as others. Why give another individual $1600 increase who does not do nearly as much work? These are the things I oppose.

Take Alexander LeMessurier. Are you prepared to reconsider his salary?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—No. There will be no further increases in the salaries in the Estimates.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—What about Mr. Fox? What did he do to you that you won't increase his salary? I want to know on what basis you give increases.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—I won't tell you.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Well, you should. You should have courtesy enough to come in here and explain matters when you are asked. I am a public servant, and so are you, and I want the information for the public. If you are not prepared to give information why did you open the House? Is that the way to treat the people who elected you?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—They elected me twice.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—They elected you twice. Well, I was elected nine times and you will have some going to beat that, and now keep quiet. Mr. Chairman, ask the gentleman to keep quiet. Well, Mr. Chairman, according to the disposition of the Minister of Finance this evening we don't expect much from him. He is here with Estimates he is not prepared to explain. He is not prepared to table the report of the Commissioners who inquired into those matters. He says that the Estimates are based on that report, and he will not let us see that report, and we as representatives of certain portions of this Island have to take it from him, that these are his Estimates, and that he is going to pass them. Well, now, all I want to tell him, is that if that is the position he intends to take, that he will not be in the Government long. He will have to alter his tactics, because the people want satisfaction and courtesy from the members of this House. To-day we are not confronted with the conditions of thirty years ago. The people are more enlightened, and the Minister will find that if he is not prepared to come here and do the right thing by the people who sent him here, he will soon find himself outside this House. If he thinks that it is the right way to push a lot of stuff down the people's throats, until they elect him, and then he can do what he likes, then he is mistaken, and he must remember that he will have to return to the same people for re-election, and they will turn him down. He must not forget that he will not be here all the time. The time will come when he will get the same dose as the honourable gentlemen, who preceded him, and his action this afternoon, in refusing to explain the increases in the Estimates, has no precedent in any of the honourable gentlemen who occupied that position before his time. Every courtesy was extended to the members by the men who preceded him in this House as far as the Estimates were concerned, and every satisfaction was given to every detail. Every question was answered and still we have to come in here and listen to the Minister in charge of the Finance Department tell us what he likes or tell us nothing. That is poor satisfaction for the people outside. You cannot tell me anything about Estimates, sir, but I want you to tell the country the truth of the matter. What about the two million of dollars to meet your Estimates within the current year? Personally, I am not a bit concerned about the Estimates. I know that it is question of political pull and political influence as regards the salaries in the Estimates to-day. It is not secret, sir. That is the reason why some salaries are increased and others are decreased. It is not a fair and equitable basis for any department to work on. Your manner and disposition

in this House this evening does not trouble me a little bit. It is my duty on behalf of the people of the country to ask you for information in relation to the Estimates. There is no reason why I should not ask you for any information that is desirable. I hope I have not insulted the Hon. Minister by asking him about the salary of Mr. Woods. There is nothing unfair or unreasonable in asking that question. Here is a man receiving $1512 per annum and a man who went into that department after him and holding a position under him getting $2000. Is this fair or is it just? Surely this House and this country is not going to tolerate the attitude and disposition of the Minister of Finance this evening, and surely the Hon. Mr. Barnes, who is looked upon as a fair-minded man in this House is not going to stand for this; nor is the other strong man I refer to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, going to stand for it, because if he is, it is not what he had been preaching or practising. There does not seem to be any discrimination evident in that department over which he presides. The men in that department who supported the late Government are enjoying the same increases as the others. Here we have the Minister of Finance recommending to the Executive that the salary of Mr. Woods shall not exceed fifteen hundred dollars and those under him given a substantial increase.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—That is what is pinching your corns.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—No, but that is what is pinching Mr. Woods' corns. That is unjust and unmanly and if we have to put up with this position that we are to receive no satisfaction from the Minister in charge of the Estimates, then the only thing we can do is to register our strong protest against the treatment meted out to some officials of the Civil Service. I for one will do all in my power to change any vote in these Estimates that I think is not desirable, I do not care what the result will be. It is unfair and unjust and unmanly to say that Mr. Woods is to receive $1500 and men who work side by side with him are to receive $3000 and $3600. It is unfortunate that there is a crowd of men who are associated with the Minister who know of this thing and who I am not prepared to say are real men. My answer to them, if they stand for that sort of treatment, is that they are only tools and not independent men of this House. By what right and what authority do you treat any individual in that way? You may grin but you do not feel it, and you may yet grin on the other side of your mouth. Some gentlemen on the other side well know that when we appointed that Commission to enquire into the Civil Service, they knew no politics. We were prepared to do the right thing. Here this evening the Finance Minister himself intimated to this House that he recommended the several votes; not according to what was right and not according to the work done and not according to his judgment, but, as I take it, according to the way they voted on the third of November last. In considering these Estimates we should not judge a man according to the way he voted. Because if we are to expect the kind of injustice, as indicated by the Minister, well, then, Heaven help the people of this country. It is our business to criticize these Estimates and your business to mind your own business.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—I am trying to do that and you won't let me.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Well I do not think you are trying very much. I think you have been handled like you were handled last fall.

HON MINISTER OF FINANCE

AND CUSTOMS:—It is quite a job to handle me.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—I know it is, but all the same you got your terms. You were one of the men who gave out the false information last fall and everything you handed out was false. For instance, you gave out a statement that it only cost the Colony $2000 to raise $1,000,000. I hope you will give an explanation to this as well as to the many other questions. When you stated that the raising of a loan of one million dollars only cost the Colony $2000, that tells me how much you know of your department.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—You know it all.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—I knew enough to conduct it properly. You came in here with Estimates intimating that one clerk was to get $1500 and his brother clerk was to get $3600 for doing the same work. There was no such thing happened within the past twelve years.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—I read the Hansard of your Estimates for 1917.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—I hope you will pursue what you read and if you will go out of office with the same record as I did, we will present you with an address, though not from me, beacuse I do not think you worthy of it. There were certain things you did that would not commend themselves to me. You would have accepted a similar position from the late Government if you had got the opportunity.

AND CUSTOMS:—It's a lie. I refuted that statement before and I asked you to make an affidavit.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—I have no use for affidavits. There is one outstanding already against your Prime Minister at the present time, which he has failed to make good. At the very mention of affidavits your chief blushes.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—There are three, one from Mr. Howley, one from Mr. Higgins and one from Mr. Woodford.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—It is up to you to give the fourth.

MR. HIGGINS:—And there is the fifth one from Mr. Gibbs.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—There is a lot of people waiting to arrest the man who made that affidavit. It is really none of my personal business, but it is the business of the Governor and the Judges of the Supreme Court.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Go to it.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—You mean the men behind you to go to it. If I were Minister of Justice and you were guilty you would have a black and white leg on and I would have this matter probed to the bitter end and would want to have it in black and white to show that the Prime Minister is innocent before I would be prepared to lay under the stigma which now adorns his head.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—That is Sir Michael's record.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—If you are not guilty, why not deal with Mr. Woodford, who made the charge against you. You have all the machinery necessary to handle him. There are a lot of people interested in this episode. What is wrong that you do not move. Now Mr. Finance Minister please do not mention that word affidavit any more. If you had any consideration for your chief and if you had more carefully considered what you were about to say at that time, I doubt if you would have used that word affidavit. Mr. Chairman, I was going on to say, when I was interrupted, that the Hon. Minister of Finance was prepared to take any side in politics last fall.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—It is a lie.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—It tickles you, but it is the truth, and it is part of your duty to deny it.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—You came to my office.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—That is about all that your patriotism and your liberalism and your politics amounted to. The people do not know you yet sir. The Government had a despicable record during the last eight months and you have been working over time to provide evidence for your chief and I am here this evening, but not in the position in which the Prime Minister finds himself. I have no such stigma on my character. He is right up against the ropes at the present time. I would not like to be in his position to-day. It is you who have brought up this matter. You have been stumbling right through and now you are stumbling over the affidavit in your statements before the House. He is in the position of the Prime Minister of this Colony and he has to clear himself as we would be doing right if he did, not by giving the severe reprimand he deserves.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—There was a charge against you and you never answered it.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—You got detectives down and had every civil servant endeavouring to secure evidence in that department and you spent twelve thousand dollars in carrying out your spite in that direction, and here we are with the House open for two months and you come in and in a fashion that would not do credit to a boy from the Christian Brothers or other schools, have presented the Estimates to the country in the form in which you presented them a day or so ago. You then hold out your chest and say what a great man Brownrigg is. It is already written all over you. I know you want to be on that side. I was there twenty years ago. Where were you twenty years ago? I was here twenty years before you. I was on this side and that side. I was on every side of the House and all around it. You will not be a success as a politician in this House and of this I serve notice here and now. I worked hard and at the fishery too and you never did any hard work. And hard work I had to do I did it. Pardon me if I am away from the point, but I am only giving an estimate instead of considering one. I am quite in order, Mr. Chairman. The member on the other side has brought up the affidavit matter. I am going astray. Point it out to me. You are the only chairman for this House and you ought to see that the Finance Minister is kept in order. I have done nothing wrong. Tell me anything I have done and if it is not right I will take it back. I will discuss the affidavit as he mentioned it first and I am going to reply. If the Prime Minister were in a good position relative to the affidavit he would not blush when I mentioned it and would also have the Courts thrash the matter and have a decision whether he is right or wrong and if right have Woodford arrested for perjury. This is the right place to talk and exhibit square facts and not outside the House nor in the newspapers or through report. The right place for such a discussion is right here in this House. Squires and Brownrigg do not want to hear those facts but think that they ought to be put away but I am not going to be tied down even by the Chairman. I am going to get there always but to get back to these Estimates, before they pass this House, I think the Opposition will agree with me that there is going to be a lot of opposition and the people of this Colony have got to get a show. The House has been open now nearly two months and here we are at the time of the caplin school. I wonder if he knows what this means. We have been discussing measures of no importance as the order papers will

show. We are not discussing measures which we should have discussed last January and February. Take some of the men on the other side to-day. They are not anxious to be here. They do not want to be here. Their interest is not here, it is down home attending to the fishery, but according to the Government's plans we are here to-day discussing simple matters brought in day after day. It can be truthfully said that not one measure of any consequence has been brought in this House altho it is now open for two months and we will be soon told that no other measure is to come. The manifesto of the leader of the Government as handed out to the country last year promised everything from the stars down. Improvements were to be made in the coastal service. Education was to be attended to. Taxation was to be given attention and even prohibition, and here we are after two months and the fringe of the manifesto has not been touched. Now that is the position and now comes the Finance Minister and he tables the Estimates showing an increase of two million dollars.

MR. MacDONNELL:—Mr. Chairman, I think it is usual in this House in going through the summary of the Estimates to make a kind of a general criticism under the item which shows the national debt. Apparently it is now increased, the interest is greater. Anyway I am not going to do that. It seems that the report of the Commission sees fit to do so. It is through political pull that these big increases in salaries have been acquired. I wish t osay and I believe that this will continue until such time as we see competitive examination necessary to get a civil service position and until that is the basis on which one secures a position in the Civil Service political pull will still play its role and that is a matter of such importance that I am surprised that there has not been before this some discussion about it. During the two months of this session we have only brought in bills for changing the verbiage of some of the Consolidated Statutes and this matter of competitive examination strikes at the root of the civil service and a bill should be brought in making competitive examination necessary to obtain a position in the civil service. I do not know much about this in other countries except the British Isles where there is an age limit according to the various departments and there is an entrance examination for each class of work, first class and second class as the case may be. Your seniority dates from the date of your examination in what ever class it may be and when a servant dies promotion is given according to seniority and political pull plays no part whatever. A man would then get a position according to his place in the competitive examination, and according as a vacancy occurred the man next in line would fill the vacancy. I want to see that thing brought before this House, and brought before it very speedily. As I look over the Estimates I see no mention of it. I see that there is to be an increase of $300,000 on the amount expended for education, but there is no indication as to how this amount is to be expended. Why all this secrecy? I see here $2700 cut out for a Deputy Minister of Education, but we have no idea as to who this Deputy Minister is going to be. We do not know but he will be a doctor as the head of the department. We don't know but the one man is now drawing several salaries. There would be abundant precedent for it. I know something of this work of education, and I want a lot of information before I am prepared to vote the amounts set down here. I note that there is an amount of $70,000 to be given to the Boards. We have absolutely no information about this, whether it is to

be divided among the Boards to be used by them or to be used by the Minister of Education. It is a queer thing that the Minister is not here. I say that every cent of money spent in this country comes under this head, and every man who is head of a department should be here.

We come down to the sparsely populated localities. If there is one grant that should be increased it is this one. I am glad that the Minister is coming back to the House. I was saying, Mr. Chairman, that while we are asked to vote $300,000 we are refused any information as to what the duties of the department are. We are asked to vote $70,000 to the Boards, but we don't know whether the Minister is going to interfere with the Boards or not. We are asked to vote a sum for inspection of schools. Is this going to be spent by the Minister? I was inspector of schools and out of a salary of $1200 paid my own expenses.

HON. MINISTER OF EDUCATION: —Mr. Chairman, I wish to say for the information of the honourable member that I had intended that this matter be deferred until the bill was brought before the House when it would be explained in detail.

MR. McDONNELL:—I am glad it is the intention of the Minister to explain the whole thing in detail.

Coming now to the Department of Agriculture and Mines I find that there is an increase of $25,000. We come to that somewhat hardy annual, the model farm, and despite the fact that the gentleman in the Upper House has spent considerable time in explaining the benefits of this thing I say now that this $25,000 would be better spent in the actual encouragement of the agriculture of the country. I remember something of the bye-election in St. John's West. I visited practically all the farming settlements and the people said they were going to vote for Mr. Squires and Mr. Brownrigg because they were going to make a model farm. The Minister used to have a strong tendency towards St. George's, and he might have put it in that farming district. Or the call of blood might be stronger, and he might put it in Prince Edward Island. It would be just as much benefit to this country. Then we are asked to vote $10,000 for the encouragement of agriculture. This is to strengthen the quality of the stock. We weren't told that they were to come from P.E.I. where all the blue noses come from. Another bill provides $7000 for surveyor's supplies. This may be because the head of the department is a medical man. Now I wonder if the head of the department is going to send all the surveyors out of the city fully equipped with everything for agricultural purposes.

Mr. Chairman, I was just considering the Department of Agriculture and Mines when the Committee rose and had got to the matter of surveyors. There was a bit of a tangle some time ago over a mining grant in the district I represent. In looking over the chart in the Lands Office I found that one surveyor had placed this claim on one side of a brook and another surveyor had placed it on the other side. In the case in question the gentleman who had the grant was given a claim of bog land on the north side of the brook while the real claim was on the south side, however I have no doubt this matter will be cleared up. Now we come to another important matter, that of forest fires, in connnection with which there is a vote of $13,500, and I do not think that any time could be more opportune than the present to deal intelligently with this question. Heavy losses of valuable timber have been sustained all over the country and I trust that when this vote comes up, hon. members will give the best suggestions they can to help the Govern-

ment and particularly the Department of Agriculture and Mines cope with this menace in the future. In the district I represent we escaped very well this season; we had fires it is true but fortunately they did not reach the good timber. However, we may not have the same good fortune next year.

The next matter I would refer to is that of logging inspectors. Now under the present arrangement, the advent of these men into the logging camps is always well known and everything is put in apple-pie order for their coming. consequently their work is without any effect whatever and the money voted in this way, unless the order of things is greatly changed, is a useless waste. In the case of Customs inspection the same thing applies as it does in every other form of inspection in this country. The men engaged in this work should be allowed to go and come at their own desire, because why? The chances are the logging inspector like the inspector of saw-mills is subject to the convenience of the Agriculture and Mines Department and has to carry on his work in accordance with a set program. These should be in a sub-department to themselves and the inspectors should be at liberty to come and go as they please, and more particularly is this so in the case of Customs inspection. At present the Customs Inspector is subject to the department and if the department is all right, very well but if the head of the department is wrong, if he is crooked, if he is venial, then he can send the inspector north while some friend of his is doing some smuggling on the south coast.

In this increased grant of $59,000 not one dollar has been voted the way that I would like to see it voted that is for the clearing of new land. I have spoken half a dozen times on this subject already and I am going to speak again. We are speaking on an increased revenue of nearly two million dollars and not one dollar has been voted for the clearing of land. We are banking everything on the fishery pure and simple and if the fishery goes wrong everything goes up and while we find the Minister of Marine and Fisheries very apt and properly in encouraging the fishery we find that nothing has been done for the encouragement of any other industry. Nobody will deny that the main scource of income is the fishery yet there is not a country in the world that has subsidary industries and does not encourage them. We are putting all our eggs in the one basket. The Government is going to shoulder the burden of $50,000 to improve the salt situation but it is an absolute gamble. A fisherman puts his gear into the water and he is not sure that he will ever take it out again. I advocated at a previous date in this session that money he expended for the encouragement of our agriculture because the one cry in every country of the world is "back to the land." This is the slogan that has been taken up by every other government and every other part of the Empire and even in perhaps the most conservative part of the whole Empire the British Isles. The land purchase system was introduced in Ireland by which the right was given to tenants to purchase their land and pay back to the government in yearly instalments not greater than their previous rate of rent. That is why Ireland was the only country in Europe that didn't suffer during the war.

Mr. Chairman, that is the result of wise legislation ten years ago. We are to-day importing year after year agricultural products that we could grow here. There is no need to import one dollar's worth of hay, potatoes or crops of that kind; there is no reason that with proper encouragement that we should not have sufficient seed crops of our own. We have the land, any

amount of it, and to-day it is in the same state as it was ten years ago. A scheme for the encouragement of agriculture on the following lines should have been here long ago. Money should have been loaned by the Government to those interested in the farming of land not already cleared at an interest of 6% or 5½% or whatever it would cost the Government to raise the money. These would be paid to the Government to raise the money. These would be paid to the Government within a period of say fifteen years. The first five years those who received that money would pay interest on the whole sum. Beginning with the sixth year one tenth of the loan and interest would be paid and at the end of the fifteen years the whole sum would have been paid back. Now one hundred thousand dollars put to that use would cost the country about six thousand dollars to raise, in actual fact it would cost nothing, because if it were loaned to those who are interested in the encouragement of agriculture the interest could be paid back annually. The Government would have first claim on the property. It is a business proposition, a money proposition if you wish to make it so, and imagine what that would mean, one hundred thousand dollars loaned by the Government a year to the men who want to take advantage of it. It would mean that after fifteen or twenty years we would be self-producing with regard to vegetables, and this is a scheme for which not one dollar could be available, and as if that were too progressive we were afraid to go back to the times when a couple of years ago a bonus was paid for the clearing of land, but we come in here and vote sixty or seventy thousand dollars, some of it, twenty-five thousand dollars of it for a model farm fad. It just happens that some people take a model farm in the same way that others take to photography, and they will find it just as expensive a luxury as the snapshooters find photography. The Government could vote thirty-five thousand dollars to this model farm, but not one dollar to the men who can better this country by production. We can come here thirty-six of us and we can vote thirty-six thousand dollars a year for ourselves, one thousand for each, but we cannot find a dollar for the encouragement of men who would give better value to the general public for every dollar spent that way than the thirty-six thousand dollars paid us. In conjunction with you, sir, and other honourable members on the other side of the House, I preached this policy of Liberal Reform last year, and I believed in it, I believed that there was something in it, I believed that this country would be a better country to live in, a bigger country, a better developed country, but I see no indications now to justify me in that belief. As has already been pointed out in this House this afternoon, we have done nothing of any consequence in the past two months, and we here in this House now at a time when we should not be in session at all. One honourable gentleman on the other side of the House asked whose fault it was, as much as to say that it is the fault of the Opposition. Apparently the idea is broadcast that the business of the Opposition is to come here and sit still and say nothing except as the hon. member for St. John's East has said, to say amen to the legislation of the Government, and if he does venture to exercise his right to question and criticise he is told by this House and the press and the party touts he meets on the street that he is an obstructionist. I wish to tell the House, sir, that if we wanted to obstruct, rather than criticise, that we do not lack perception to seize upon opportunities and we are quite capable of putting our views into effect when

we do see them. I have not got much say, I am too young in this House, but if I did there would have been obstruction in this House long ago. To think that the threat of an irresponsible in a newspaper or the sneers of political opponents is sufficient to muzzle people who I take it possess average intelligence is too ridiculous for contemplation. I take it that the reason that these Estimates were delayed until now, that the reason that the opening of this House was delayed so long, was because a certain member of the Executive Government thought that he could work his newspaper to the extent of muzzling his opponents. If that was the idea, sir, I wish to say that it is not the first error of judgment that that honourable gentleman has made. These Estimates are not going without discussion. If there is any particular thing in them, which I think should be discussed, as far, as I know, I don't care how long it takes me, I will ask members on the other side of the House, to bear with me, if I do not come to the point quickly, I will discuss every vote that should be discussed, and all the criticism of my opponents will not disturb me in the slightest

Now we come to a vote on roads. I got a particular assurance last Fall, that the worst need of my district, that of having roads of some kind, to connect the settlements, would be the first thing, that would occupy the attention of the Government. In the District of St. George's the amount voted for local roads, in 1919 and 1920 was three thousand seven hundred and twenty-seven dollars. Now I want the honourable members to realise what that means. Some members representing constituents in the city, and in Conception Bay might not know what that means to the Pioneer district in this country. The people of St. George's are getting the same per capital grant to build new roads, as the people of St. John's get to keep in repair roads that have been built for the last fifty or a hundred years, and not one cent is increased in the vote to St. George's. When they increased the sessional pay of members from three hundred dollars to one thousand dollars, but that will be poor comfort to the man who has to walk knee deep in mud, to get from his house to his fishing stage or to the children of settlements, who have to go through the woods as they have to in Bay of Islands, to get to th eone school there. It is not good to them to be told that the Government, have dealt in a magnificent way with the district, when they have increased the sessional pay of the members from three hundred to one thousand dollars, when the per capita grant for building roads in the district is the same as the per capita grant in the city for keeping up roads that have been built for fifty years. I made one promise last fall to the people of St. George's, and I made it because I was told to make it I was told I could it on the word of the Prime Minister, and that was, that a large special grant, would be set aside, each year, over the above the per capita grant. There is not mention of it here yet. The grant for local roads is the same as it was last year. There is additional expenditure of nearly three million dollars and there is $25,000 provided for a Model Farm, but there is not an additional dollar voted for the clearing of roads. That may be reform in the opinion of some people, but it is not a progressive reform, but retrogressive. The fact will be brought home to those people on the West Coast more strongly than ever before that because they are three hundred miles away form this the Capital, that they do not count. I want to impress upon Hon Members of this House who represent constituencies equally far from this Capital and constituencies where the same needs are and where tthe people are

crying out to-day that provision is made out of the two million dollars voted in cases where it has been shown there was no reason for it, and the one grant which should have been increased and that it is the business of this House to see that it is increased, remains cold. One of the big things we were told that was going to be done for St. George's District was that there would be two members put in this district instead of one. That reminds me of a certain gentleman who was going to make two blades of grass grow where one grew before, so that the present Premier is not alone in this theory. The wonderful promises made in the celebrated manifesto have all gone away. We were told that the roads and highways would be given special attention, but I see no indication that this promise will be fulfilled. In spite of all the things that were going to be done for roads and highways as promised by the Prime Minister, the same money that they got last year is voted again this year. We are asked to build roads and maintain them at the same old grant that they were maintained for 150 years ago. Then there is the question of the railway. This is a matter of some importance to those of us who live on the western side of the country, particularly in the district that I represent and which at present has one port of call for a coastal boat for the whole of the two bays. As far as this side of the country is concerned there is no other means of communication with the railway. Now I have asked three or four times already as to what is being done by the Government to remedy the condition of the railway and to put it in a fit state for passenger traffic and the transportation of freight. I always got replies that a Committee of Council were considering the matter and that a report would be made in due course. As long as I can remember there have been Committees considering this same question and they will be considering it until the next general election comes around. Then perhaps the gentleman who represents the district of St. George's will say that he will see that the contractors live up to their contract. But it will be like the cat with the nine lives. After coming back from the country the Commission will sit again and will be sitting until the next general election will come round, but will never report thereon. The seriousness of that may not be easily perceived by those who do not know what it means, but to those people on the West Coast who have only one way of communication it can be very quickly conceived. Take that section around the Codroy Valley where the people produce far in excess of what they want for victualling themselves. The people up there sell potatoes in the Fall of the year at $1.50 per barrel cheaper than what they sold in St. John's for. I remember one time when Sir Edward Morris was on a visit to that locality and when he was enquiring into the prices of vegetables there. He was very much interested in what he saw, in fact he had a fashion for getting interested in local affairs of any people with whom he came in contact. While enquiring into the prices of the various products he commenced to point out to the people how much better off they would be if they would send their commodities to St. John's for sale. An old farmer who hails from the south of Ireland said to Sir Edward that that reminded him of the story at home between the farmer and the tourist. The story goes that this farmer was leaning over a fence and was looking out at some 15 or 20 ducks swimming in a mill in his garden and an English tourist came along and asked him what he was going to do with them. The farmer replied that he was going to eat them. The tourist said you are very foolish for that, for if you send those ducks to the

market in London you would get ½£ per pound for them. The farmer, who was up against railroad conditions like what prevails in this country, said how would I get them there. And then turning to the tourist the farmer stated emphatically if that garden was in Hell what a good price I would get for it, the farmer knowing that he would have just as good a chance to get water in Hell as he would to get for his ducks the price named by the tourist. The same applied to the people on the West Coast with regard to the good prices that they would get in St. John's for their products, under our present railroad conditions. It seems funny that at every general election each party blames the other of being controlled by the Reids and each one say that they are determined to keep the Reids up to their contract, but they all fail to vote a single dollar for the upkeep of the railroad. The road is getting worse gradually and an occasional train goes twenty or thirty yards in the woods by way of diversion; fifteen or twenty persons are burned and three or four die as a result. And yet we come here and listen to members of this Assembly express themselves as being very indignant when told that they voted as a party. They deny the idea that they voted as they like. They always did vote as a party and always will, and, perhaps, it is a good thing that there is party voting, because imagine every one of us looking at things and viewing things from different angles. I cannot see how this Government can blame the people for protesting when this very important matter of the railway is untouched. And I tell hon. members of this House that the people are not slow in remembering that while we look after ourselves handsomely that we were very slow indeed in looking after their interests. We are told that the report of the Commission had something to do with these Estimates. How many Coroner's verdicts had we and how many reports had we from the Government Engineer. It is a well known fact that a man takes his life in his hands travelling over the railroad to-day, but we can vote $25,000 for a model farm; $1000 for sessional pays of members and $4000 for Ministers, but nothing for the maintenance of the railway line. And that reminds me that the celebrated Commissioners recommended that every Minister of a Department should get $4000 and they laid down the principle that no one man with two ministerial positions combined should get more than $6000. That is one of the recommendations of the Commissioners and one that it seems is convenient to forget. I should imagine that the Prime Minister's salary to-day is somewhere in the neighbourhood of from twelve to fifteen thousand dollars. Well that is only 250 per cent more than the Commissioners recommended. Twenty per cent of an increase was considered sufficient and in some cases in the Government too much, but it appears that 250 per cent was not too big a price and not too big a reward for the Prime Minister. This is all the more remarkable when it is considered that the same gentleman was the one who said that he did all that was humanly possible for any party to do to lessen the taxation on the people. How we used to talk last Fall about other gentlemen who held two jobs. It does not matter whether they did the work or not they are getting three salaries and that as I said is wrong and the men on that side of the House said was wrong and they still vote for it or I presume they will vote for it. It is quite a change we have seen. What has caused this? It was all wrong last October, it was sin which cried up to Heaven for vengeance, well surely it is not deserving of our support at the present time. I have been accused in

this House of inconsistency. The honourable the Prime Minister on one occasion referred to my inconsistency. I do not know whether it would be right or fitting that ordinary member of this House should charge the Prime Minister with inconsistency. Why condemn in another man what you do yourself? In one case you must either lie or else you are inconsistent. It is either one or both. Now in this matter I find that certain gentlemen of the Commission are to blame for the two and one half million dollar expenditure. Now take the Magistrates classified according to the first, second and third classes. The salaries voted or recommended there by the Commission and the salary voted in the Estimates contain a difference of three hundred dollars. Probably the opinion of the Government is that various Magistrates over this country are not considered worthy of the increase of salary, that their work is not of sufficient importance, the work of keeping the peace and this is a matter which does not merit consideration and commendation of the Government. If that is the salary for the Magistrates the Government certainly look at the matter from a peculiar angle. I hope that when the Budget is introduced that some increase scheme will be shown by which they can still pay an increase of two million dollars in taxes and still have a reduction of the high cost of living and if this is done the Government of the day will have accomplished a lot. I do not know whether that can be brought about as I do not know enough about high finance but I think it is desirable that while we have increased expenditure we should also have a lowering of the high cost of living at the same time. The fishermen have to pay ten cents as an export duty on fish and they promised that the war tax of twenty cents per quintal on fish would be taken off and now they want another ten cents instead of taking off the war tax of twenty cents per quintal and these men will have very little comfort when they realise this. Especially when they are informed that certain gentlemen in this House will receive salaries from twelve to fifteen thousand per year and that they will have to be taxed an additional fifty per cent on fish. The War Tax is being continued altho Peace has been signed a couple of years and it has been added to by fifty per cent to make matter worse. That the money is being spent in a way that no other money has been spent is only a matter of theory. The ultimate result will show. Now that is all I have to say for the present but when each particular vote comes up I shall have something to say if I am able to talk about it provided it is different from that which it should be and I shall not be afraid to do so even if charges of obstruction are levelled at me.

MR. MOORE:—I was glad to hear this evening when the member for St. George's asked the Minister of Education if he was intending to take the vote. Like the member for St. George's I am interested in that vote and I have told the Minister in private conversation that I had a story to tell this House when that Bill comes down. I am afraid I will not be able to subscribe to some of the increases in the vote. While in the district for which I have the honour to be one of its representatives I had to tell them that the widows and orphans would still get the dole of five dollars per quarter and this was a mere camouflage. And until such time as this Government can see its way clear to increase that dole I intend to vote against those increases given to officials who were getting eighteen hundred dollars and now are getting three thousand six hundred. In relation to the G.W.V.A. of which the Minister of Justice is a member he accused me some time ago in this As-

sembly of a criticism again the G.W.V. A., and said that those who wore the badge were as patriotic as those who were to the war. I say that is not the case. I will back my patriotism against his any day and say those who wore the badge were not and are not as good as those who were to the war. If he will look up the records of the G.W. V.A. he will find that I did more than he did for that Association. The widows and orphans have got no increases but those who were getting two thousand dollars are now getting three thousand six hundred dollars. The Minister of Justice stated in this House in discussing the address in reply that those who wore the badge were entitled to positions and were just as worthy as those who went over and fought but I can say that they were and slackers have been given Government positions while out on the streets you will see the legless and armless soldier looking for a job. Four years ago when we went down to say farewell to them we pledged ourselves that we would not forget them when they would come back. Yes, they have come back but we are finished with them now and we say to Hell with them. Now that is the position we are in. I might also state that down in the Customs House there was a position but it was given to the defeated candidate for St. John's West. As long as I am spared to remain in public life I will endeavour to make that job right for the returned soldier. I am not finished with the returned soldier and will take the model farm. I visited the model farm yesterday. I was out that way yesterday and as I heard a lot about it I thought I would go in and see it. I found five men and five horses there and I asked them what they intended to grow there and they answered "Well we cannot say what you can grow in this country but we are sure you can grow whiskers." I also noticed that they were setting turnips there and I am sure these turnips will cost the Colony thirty dollars per barrel. The Minister will be soon packing his saratoga and will be off in a few days to spend the fifty-five thousand voted. We have come to a pretty pass if we are asked to vote fifty-five thousand dollars to spend twenty-five thousand of it on a model farm such as we have in at the Sanitorium. The increases that have been given to some officials I agree with and do so with the thirty per cent given by the late government and I think until such time as we can increase the pensions of old aged fishermen, the quarterly payment for the widows and orphans we should go slowly especially when we can give thirty-six hundred dollars per year to those who were receiving fifteen hundred per year. May I ask the Minister of Education if it is his intention to bring down the Education Bill on Wednesday?

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Chairman, like most of the previous speakers I feel very much disappointed over the estimates. I have the estimates here before me, and side by side I have the manifesto of the Hon. the Leader of the Government. I have gone through the manifesto, I have read some of the great things foreshadowed, and I have to say that in view of the manifesto the estimates are a great disappointment to me and to the public. Despite these most extraordinary times the Minister of Finance has come in here and asked the members to vote an extra $2,000,000, and absolutely no attention is paid to the matters of most vital importance. We find the amount allotted to each department greately increased, and these increases are only to satisfy political influences as has been so well pointed out by the leader of the Opposition and others. We have to tax the fishermen $2,000,000 extra to meet these increases. I remember the leader of one of the wings of the

Government, the leader of the F.P.U., on many occasions pleading for the poor fishermen and sarcastically referring to the $50.00 paid to the worn out fishermen by the Morris Government, and if ever he got the opportunity he would increase that amount by 100%. But now that he is leader of one of the wings of the Government we don't hear a thing about it. The people who supported him will regard him as insincere and untrustworthy. When that $50.00 was given it was the best that could be done. At that time $50.00 was as good and would go as far as $150 or $200 to-day. $7.00 would buy a barrel of flour, $4.00 would buy a pair of boots, and $15.00 a suit of clothes. Is it reasonable to come in here and ask the honourable members to give their sanction to these estimates that entirely neglect the poor fishermen, whether these people belong to the West Coast or to Bonavista Bay? These people who are bringing in the money into the treasury of the country to pay the Ministers salaries are absolutely neglected. I think it is regretable, I think it is indecent, and that is stronger, for the Hon. Minister of Finance to bring in estimates that have so forgotten the hard toiling fishermen of the country. You have the widows and the orphans to look after. It is only those who have been close to them who know the circumstances and who can appreciate them. In the district that I have the honor to represent there is a large number of poor people. Owing to the great hardships and the numerous dangers which the men have to encounter in their work there are a great many widows and orphans. I regret that there is no provision made to care for them, and it is nothing to the credit of the Hon. Minister of Finance and his associates that these people are absolutely ignored in the estimates. Then there are the returned men, the soldiers and the sailors. What provisions have we made for them? These men answered the call when you and I were unable to do so. They shouldered the gun for themselves and for us. Now how unthankful we are to them? I know many of the men who, driven by absolute necessity, have had to go down to some shipping office, buy their tickets and leave here for some other country where, if they want to succeed, they may have to foreswear allegiance for all time to the British Empire. The announcement was made some time ago that some ships were to be purchased by the Government and that another was being presented to the Colony by the British Admiralty, and I made enquiries with the object of ascertaining what possible chance there was for these ships being manned by those men who had borne for us the heat and burden of the war, and at least two of them from my own constituency made application to the Shipping Board. One of them was a man who went overseas as an ordinary seaman, but he was rapidly promoted and returned an officer. He went to school and studied navigation to fit himself for a position of the kind and then applied for a position on one of these ships. He was told that the position was filled and on enquiry it was found that the position was filled by a political heeler. The result is that that man is now in the United States. If that is the sort of reform the Government has to work in this country, then I don't want to be classed as a reformer. In going thru these estimates there is one thing that strikes me forcibly and it is this, in every case where an increase is made it is in the case of what might be termed for the sake of distinction, the upper class official, there is absolutely nothing for the poor man. Take the couriers for instance, who have to take up their bags of mail and go out into the storm, take the courier at Badger, I mention him par-

ticularly because I happen to know more about that section, perhaps, than any other, he has to leave Badger and brave the storms of the long stretch to Hall's Bay, to Little Bay Islands, then to Cape John and down around White Bay to Cape Norman when navigation is closed but what provision is made for this man? He may get a free hand to shoot rabbits or beavers but that's about all. It is the same in the case of the fishery warden, the man who is supposed to protect our fisheries. If the job is not one of sufficient importance to pay the man who is engaged on it a living salary then why have it in existence at all. Similarly, the tide waiters, outport poor commissioners, all are ignored. There is no provision for telegraph extension despite the fact that since this House opened, numerous petitions have been presented on the subject and ministers and heads of departments have occupied hours at a time elaborating on the great necessity of telephone and telegraph extension in certain settlements thruout the country, and right here I want to mention a circumstance that has already been referred to by one of the speakers on this side of the House. The idea has been sent abroad that the House was delayed by the obstruction of the Opposition. If there has been any unnecessary obstruction I have not seen it except on the part of the Government themselves and particularly on the part of the Executive members. I have been here at three o'clock every day and the House is never called together before half past three or a quarter to four and then we find an order paper that could be gone thru in twenty minutes, yet in face of this we are told that the session is being delayed by the obstruction tactics of the Opposition. I want to inform the House that if any obstruction were found necessary, and the Hon. Minister of Justice is a good judge of how it should be practiced, we have enough material on this side of the House to keep us here till Christmas. The only intention I have is to see that the public get a square deal. On the opening day when the speech of His Excellency the Governor was being discussed, a matter was brought to the notice of the House by the Leader of the Opposition, and this was made necessary because of the neglect of the Department of Justice to take the matter up as it was his duty to do. I refer now to the Woodford Affidavit. A man who had occupied responsible positions in the Colony for 30 years made an affidavit containing incriminating charges against prominent members of both branches of the Legislature, and when that class of man makes an affidavit I say that it is the bounden duty of every member of this House to probe it to the very bottom and if Mr. Woodford is found guilty let him be removed to the hotel by the lakeside and if he is not guilty the man who is should not be an advisor to H. E. the Governor and his associate should not occupy a seat in the Upper House. This matter should not be winked out of sight. This is the proper place to discuss it and so far as I am concerned and the public and Mr. Woodford and Mr. Squires and Mr. Gibbs I will place myself on record as being an obstructionist to see that justice is done though the heavens may fall. Another matter I wish to draw to your attention to is the matter of aids to navigation. I had reason to believe that an substantial vote would be set aside for this purpose in the estimates. Petition after petition has been presented by members from both sides of this House for a lighthouse or some other aid on different parts of our coastline. If one takes a trip around our rocky shores and then goes to other countries and there sees the navigation aids given to those who go down to the sea in ships

it would be unnecessary to remark our inefficiency. Up in my district valuable lives have been lost and likewise in other parts of the Island. If through political animosity the Government didn't see its way clear to build a lighthouse or a fog signal in Ferryland district let them go down in Bonavista or Twillingate or St. Barbe or come down to the district represented by the Hon. Minister of Justice you will find many dangerous points and many settlements that have petitioned the Government for a warning station. The coastal service is a matter which affects my district perhaps more than any other public utility. There is a large coast line from Placentia to Trepassey and over 40 miles of the Cape Shore there are no coastal facilities. From the very first time that I came into this House I have been advocating for additional service in that district. During the period of the war and while the country was called upon to bear the burden that was being thrown upon its shoulders wec ouldn't expect any great improvements but now that the war is over and we are voting two millions of dollars of extra taxation I am expecting that something would be done. Surely the people of that section of the country who are called upon to pay dollar for dollar with the sections that have their railroad should receive their own proper share, and so far as this is concerned this is one of the reasons that will compel me to withdraw my sanction and give an absolute protest to the greater number of votes of increases which we are called upon to make. In discussing the reduction of taxation what do we find but that each taxpayer is called upon to pay an increased tax of tens of dollars per head more than last fall.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Mr. Chairman, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that we have not a quorum in the House.

MR. WALSH:—I am sorry that my hon. colleague had to draw the attention of the House to the absence of a quorum, there might be some excuse for withdrawing to have a smoke and a chat but to-night we are here to consider estimates of increases of $100 to $1000 and $300 to $1500 to $2500 to $5000. Surely any hon . member should have sufficient interest to hold his seat in the House while we are discussing estimates of such far reaching effect. I hope the chairman will not have to call the attention of the House to the absence of a quorum in future. The high cost of living is another political kite which occupies a place in the manifesto and by the estimates it has been found of such sufficient importance to give it another boost. It is not high enough so they give it another kick and put it higher. We have passed a measure to deal with profiteering and I pity the man on Water Street who will be accused of profiteering. Yes I pity him if he is an opponent of the Government. But if he is one of the men who was liberal enough to pay out the money to defray the cost of their election last fall he will not be interfered with but every encouragement will be given him. It is like that famous proclamation that has been issued by the Colonial Secretary in regard to the sugar. The small grocer who buys sugar by the barrel gets his one cent a pound of profit while the big man who can afford to buy 25 barrels or over is allowed an additional cent per pound. In the parish of Placentia where there is very little more than one thousand souls, something like one hundred and thirty, 90% of those qualified to go, physically fit and of age, offered themselves and went overseas ,and I am very sorry to say that a large percentage of those noble heroes will never come back, a large percentage of them are to-night bleaching, some of them over ground on the

plains of Gallipoli, and others on the soil of France and Flanders, and their loved ones at home have for the remainder of their lives to mourn the loss of those nobles heroes. In honour of the memory of those noble heroes the residents of the parish of Placentia erected a monument. I hold in my hand here a copy of the programme on that memorable occasion. The monument is a beautiful one and it will to some extent keep fresh in the minds of those who have no personal occasion for doing so the splendid sacrifices of the people of this parish and of other places all over the Island, and I regret that the Government have not seen their way clear to erect some substantial memorial in honour of our dead heroes. Now the other memorial that I am going to refer to is this one —the Estimates. They will go down in the history of this House when the present members of this House have passed away and their memories are forgotten because there will be no legislation passed by members in this Assembly that will be worthy of keeping their names fresh in the memory of the people, these will go down in history as the most extraordinary document ever presented by any Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs. If we were passing through normal times there would be reasonable objection to voting the extraordinary increases that we are called upon to vote, but we are not passing through normal times, we are passing through times when the people are called upon to pay three or four hundred per cent more for the necessaries of life than four or five years ago; we are passing through times when our greatest product is a drug in the market; we are passing through times when it is a common sight to go into any of the principal streets, Water Street for instance, and to meet the bone and sinew of the Colony with his yaffle of fish under his arm, his hat in his hand, and his finger in his mouth going into some of our merchant princes to know if they will buy his fish. This is an extraordinary state of affairs. I remember the time, and I daresay you, sir, remember the time, and other members of this House who were in the last House of Assembly, and members who were not in the House at that time will remember when you would take up the fishermen's paper and read in it that the price of fish was what the Pres. of the Fishermen's Protective Union wanted to make it. If he wanted to make it twenty dollars it was twenty dollars. This was defended by honourable members in this House who were associated with him, this was defended by others who were not in this House, and some of the arguments advanced in its favour were so strong that I myself was beginning to feel like Newman felt when he wrote Lead Kindly Light; but surely, Mr. Chairman, if the arguments advanced that the Hon. President of the F.P.U. made the price of fish twenty dollars then he is responsible now for the price of fish. If he took the praise for the increase in price he must take the blame for making the price five dollars. The codfishery of Newfoundland is its principal industry, and will always remain so, no matter how many auxiliary industries may crop up, and it is regrettable that we should be called upon in passing through these extraordinary times to vote such a large increase to the already over burdened tax-payers of the country, a country that is already bending under the enormous load of taxation that is being piled up year after year. A lot of it was of course absolutely necessary if we were to keep up our end of the plank in the great European War, and despite this increase they are voting nothing to some of the most important public utilities, some of which I have already

mentioned, some which I will mention now, and some which I will mention later on, and the chief one of these is the transportation by land and railroad. During the election campaign last fall pages were written about the Reid Nfld. Co. and the railroad. The Minister of Posts and Telegraphs issued a warning from his place in the House last year that the railroad was not safe to travel on and that the men who purchased a ticket to go from here to Topsail, or Manuels, or any other station along the line were taking their lives in their hands when they went aboard the car. I agree with that statement then and I agree with it now, but what has he done since in the matter? What has the leader of the Government done since? At that time it served to sway some of the electorate their way. We were told in reply to a question asked here yesterday that there would be no legislation dealing with the railroad brought down this session. Surely the Government don't think of going outside this House and bickering with the Reid Nfld. Co. in reference to this matter. I don't think they do. The matter should be dealt with here, and the Government should have pluck enough to bring in a bill and deal with it. Don't wait until tomorrow, or next week, or next month. Don't wait until you pick up a newspaper and read an awful calamity has occurred on the railroad and that lives have been lost. Don't wait until the second session of this House. You may not have another session. There may not be another session of this legislature with the personnel of the Government as it is now. Now is the time when you have the reins of office with a good following. With regard to myself, and I think I can speak for each and every member of the Opposition, any criticism that will come from this side of the House on such a bill will be meant in a friendly spirit to point out some defect in the legislation. It would be more to the credit of the Government to spend weeks or months discussing the railroad question than the bill for the preservation of beavers and other matters of no importance that have been discussed within the last two months.

Another serious matter has come to my mind, and it only came to my mind when I looked across and saw the Hon. the Minister of Education, is the amount that we are called upon to vote to this department. We are called upon to vote an enormous increase to this department, and I regret that the Government did not see its way clear to bring in your bill before they brought in the Estimates, I regret that they did not give us a chance to peep behind the scenes. The whole thing has been shrouded in mystery, and is so still. The only thing that we know is that we are called upon to vote to the Minister of Education four thousand dollars and to the Deputy Minister three thousand dollars, and the clerks down the line in accordance with those increases; and as has been pointed out by the hon. member for St. George's, the Opposition in this House does not know, and I daresay a large number of the members on the other side of the House don't know, but the Minister is the whole shooting match, minister, deputy minister, clerks, typewriter and all. I don't think that this is fair ,and if the Hon. Minister were on this side of the House that his criticism would be more severe than any that has been handed out here today or any other occasion. That is all I intend to say on this matter at the present time.

As intimated by Mr. MacDonnell, the hon. member for St. George's, I have a story to tell also when the bill comes down and the story is going to be told from my place in this House. Provision could not be made in the esti-

mates for very many of the necessary public utilities in the Island, but $35,-000 could be found to hand over to a man (Dr. Campbell) who has no more stake in this country than Dick Mc-Ghee to experiment on a model farm. Now the fishermen of this Island have got beyond that stage. With a poor voyage facing this country the present year, with that wave of prosperity that was in evidence the past few years having disappeared, with salt at a top notch price and with all the other necessary commodities, some of which are to be found on the table of the poor man, what is going to be the outcome. I say, Mr. Chairman, that this is too serious a matter to be winked out of sight. When we are prepared to juggle with the funds of this Colony and give to Dr. Campbell, who has to give no account of his stewardship to anybody, $35,000, then I for one am going to protest against it. Dr. Campbell went to St. John's West for election and was kicked out, but it appears that he had sufficient pull with the present Government to be dumped into the Upper Chamber, a chamber that has been vilified by nearly every individual and by the very men who hold office in the administration of the day. And I had the privilege myself of being in that chamber recently and listened to Dr. Campbell, the Min. of Agriculture and Mines, in his disgusting references to members of this House who dared criticise his agricultural fad. Let me predict and I predict it in all honesty and in all seriousness that it is just as well for the men in Bonavista Bay and Trinity District and all the men in the other districts for that matter if Dr. Campbell went to China with that $35,-000, because there will not be one farthing in return from that model farm. I say it is the most contemptible piece of juggling ever attempted by any government in this country since we had Responsible Government. Is it an honest Government that gives to Dr. Campbell, who is responsible to nobody and represented nowhere, $35,000 to do as he pleaces with. I might say that this is not good enough and the people of the country ought to have something to say over the squandering of their money in this fashion. If you had taken this $35,000 and sent it to some of the outport districts or to some isolated parts of our coastline where people are repeatedly petitioning this House for public utilities there would be some results therefrom. Or could that $35,000 be voted for the erection of fog alarms, light houses or some other aids to navigation that may be the means of saving many valuable lives to this country. I say without fear of contradiction that this amount voted to Dr. Campbell is an absolute waste and this country will not get 35c. returns. About the only thing it will do is to benefit the friends of the Minister or some individual who has pig pull or sheep pull with him, but so far as the general public is concerned they are not going to get a cent in return for that expenditure. When the agricultural bill was before the House I pleaded that some consideration be given to the poor people of this country who have been writing to me and other members of this House on both sides asking for some assistance. In many cases the story of those poor people is that they are unable to buy seed because of the prohibitive prices. I represented their cases in an application to the Minister of Agriculture and Mines Department and I was told to apply to the Relieving Officer and their wants would be supplied. Now, Mr. Chairman, I emphatically protested and I protest against this attitude of the Minister in trying to drag down those people, particularly, because, as I said before, he represents nobody but himself. If the Government had made provision for ten thousand dollars

worth of seed to distribute fairly and indiscriminately among the people who could ill afford to buy them, it would bring ten thousand times the returns. Potatoes in the town to-day are almost at prohibitive prices for the majority of people and are not to be found on the poor man's table. But the price does not worry the rich man. He does not care what a thing costs to go on his table. He is going to get it any how. But the poor man if he wants a barrel of flour for his family and he has not got the necessary wherewithal to get it, well then he probably has got to borrow a five dollar bill to make up the price, otherwise he has got to do without it. Apparently some of the hon. members opposite are enjoying this discussion. It may be amusing to those who are in the class that I have just referred to, but not to the men who have to fish on the Grand Banks, Cape St. Mary's, the Groais Islands and other places and who are guaranteed about five dollars a quintal for their fish. If conditions were normal there would be some excuses for the increases, but while three or four times pre-war prices are being asked for the necessaries of life, how do you expect fishermen who are absolutely depending upon what they get from year to year to support their families. I am afraid the Ship of State is fast approaching the dangerous shoals of bankruptcy or confederation and there appears to be a deliberate attempt made to place this country in such a condition that we will find it essential to send the Hon. Minister of Justice and some others of his associates to Ottawa to discuss terms with Canada, if Canada would take us in. I say that if such a condition is deliberately planned you could not go about it in a better way; you could apply no better means towards laying the foundation than in the Estimates before the House at the present moment. No sane, sound, sensible business man, or any firm or company, but knows that if they are not able to meet their liabilities they are bankrupt. The same principle applies to a Government. During the war countries loaned us money from a patriotic standpoint and money was spent freely. A state of prosperity was about us in that line and we were given the glad hand. But conditions are different to-day. Go down to any of the Banks to-day and try to borrow money for any business purpose whatever and what do you find? You find an entirely different attitude. You will find a different smile on the face of the banker than what you saw last year and the year before, and it is only on good security that money can be borrowed at all; and when that condition prevails at home the Minister of Finance cannot expect to go to the New York market or the London market or any other of the money loaning markets to obtain loans without having to pay heavy interest. Well it is only natural and reasonable to suppose and to assume that if this country happens to meet with a bad fishery this year—although it may be able to recover from one—and a second one comes equally as bad, where do we find ourselves. We will find ourselves absolutely on the rocks. And when this country was found in such a condition some years ago, we had men of integrity, men of ability and men of honesty of purpose in charge of the old Ship of State, and with some exceptions we have men of integrity, of ability and of honesty today. We have prominent men holding prominent positions in the public life of this Colony and in this chamber who stand charged with a serious offence. Until this charge is explained away satisfactorily and affidavit meets affidavit and until the leader of this House has vindicated himself of the blemishes that have fallen upon his character he should vacate his seat. How can the

country or any section of the community view with confidence any action that may be taken by the Government when it is presided over by a gentleman charged with such a serious offence. On the opening day I supported the resolutions that he should vacate his seat until the charge was disposed of. And I said that I would be one of the first to extend to him the glad hand of good-fellowship on his return to this chamber and I said this with all seriousness and from the very depths of my heart and I say so again but I do not want any juggling or camouflage and I want to see the Prime Minister get fair play and also want the public to get fair play. I also want to see Mr. Gibbs get fair play and also want to see Mr. Woodford get fair play and we can see these gentlemen getting fair play only by having a commission appointed in which the public will have confidence and over which the presiding officer will be a man of character and who will be respected by everybody irrespective of his class or creed. I say we are passing through the most extraordinary times that have ever been experienced in this Dominion or ever will be. For the last five years there has been an unprecedented wave of prosperity passing over the country. From 1909 up to 1914 this country has experienced one of the most prosperous periods it has ever experienced or ever will. During those years many were called upon to weep and many were the hours of sorrow but still there was prosperity. A large amount of money had to be borrowed to keep our place in the firing line and this amount of money was to a great extent spent at home and put in circulation and then this country met with prosperity but this prosperity is no longer in evidence. Meet anybody on the street to-day and they have a gloomy expression on their faces. That which they had previous to the war is no longer to be found. The public is alarmed at what is to be the next move. This is an extraordinary document which has been in the press for some time. A man has to pay ten dollars for a barrel of flour and consider this with a man who has a family of say five children who may be half clad and this so-called Liberal Reform Government has come into this House and through the Finance Minister has voted an increase of two million dollars to increase the already fat salaries. Then we find the sum of thirty-five thousand dollars voted to the Minister of Agriculture and Mines to squander and it is no wonder that the poor down trodden labourer of the country is crying out. I do not blame him. But there is bound to be a reaction. The pill was swallowed last autumn and that pill was coated over nicely. The Government has been absolutely dishonest as far as the working classes are concerned. I make that statement deliberately. A reduction of taxation was promised in that wonderful manifesto. In reading this particular paragraph I will now occupy the attention of the House in trying to convince the country as I know I cannot convince the House. The House has made up its mind to put through certain legislation and it has the majority and despite all the criticism it will go through. But I want to convince and warn the country that this reform government has made promises which the members who now constitute the Government do not intend to fulfil. There are sections in this country who know that it was all clap trap. They simply wanted to catch votes and merely said when we get in we will see what we can do. Thats what it amounts to. But the day of reckoning has to come and it may come sooner than anticipated by some of the members of the House. Strange to say I notice a recommendation made to the Government by the Commission that

when the Prime Minister holds two offices the salary should be $6000. When the Minister of Finance tabled the estimates he said that they were on the recommendation of the Commission. This is one that you did not accept. When we had a man like Sir Robert Bond as Prime Minister of this country he was getting only $2500. Here we have a man to-day who is under a cloud, who if he did not move in a particular circle such as the men in the gallery here to-night, would be behind the prison bars. We are voting an amount not what was given to Sir Robert Bond, not $4000 as Prime Minister and $2000 as Colonial Secretary as was recommended by the Commission, but $4000 for each job and a few additionals so as to make up a couple of thousand more. Still we are wondering why the people are showing such discontent. Why could not the incumbent of that position sacrifice a little. There are lots of men walking the streets of the city to-day without work, some men with wooden legs, some with wooden arms, men who sacrificed everything for their country. Is nothing going to be done for those men? The Prime Minister lost two chances to clear himself of that charge. When that charge was made, if it were me, I would not wait five minutes. I would get in touch with the nearest J. P. or Stipendiary Magistrate. I would have that man brought before him and have my character vindicated. That was when he lost his first chance. Having lost that opportunity he should have vacated his seat the first day of the opening of the House. If he had done that he would have made up 100% in the estimation of the people of the country.

With regard to the offiicials of his department I have very little to say. Some of them are eminently qualified men. Mr. Mews is a man of great ability. He is a man who was called up day after day during the war because of his knowledge and experience, and did he his work well. But whethe it is wise to raise his salary to $3600 I am doubtful.

Now I intended to refer to the other departments, but as there are others who want to speak I will give them a chance. I have no intention of letting the estimates go through this House until they are explained by the heads of the different departments.

There are one or two other matters to which I wish to refer. I note that a large amount of $50,000 is, as the Government says, allotted to the fishermen. The Star said yesterday in big black type that the Government had come to the rescue of the fishermen to the tune of $50,000. There is absolutely nothing in this that the Government can commend themselves on. But for the bungling of the Government when Sir John Crosbie was trying to get them to save the salt situation that $50,000 would not have been lost to the country. If the warning of Sir John Crosbie had been taken in the right spirit we might have avoided that rock, but it has made a hole in the ship and it is costing the country $50,000 to repair it. The ship has not yet absolutely foundered, but unless that bungling is stopped she is going to founder. If competent, capable men were in charge that $50,000 would have been saved.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of pleasure to the different views expressed here this afternoon and evening and I want to congratulate my colleague, Mr. Walsh, upon the able speech with which he has entertained this House for the last two and a half or three hours. Now sir, in rising to speak on these estimates before the chair, I have two minds as to how I should approach the subject. There are many ways in which we can look at these

estimates, there are many viewpoints from which we can regard the Government responsible for them, but I shall content myself this evening with viewing them from two points only. After carefully studying the estimates, I have asked myself if I should not congratulate the Government (I regret isr that this is the second time this evening that attention has had to be called to the fact that there is no quorums. The members on the Government side do not seem to be sufficiently interested in the business before the House to remain and listen to the debate). As I was about to remark when my colleague, Mr. Sinnott, drew attention to the fact that there was no quorum, I have asked myself if I should not congratulate the Government on their optimism, if I should not congratulate them upon the rosy views they take of the future prosperity, congratulate them in their assumption of the tremendous recuperative powers of the people of the country, more especially when we consider the present condition of the people generally and more especially when we consider the period of reconstruction which is bound to follow for a year or two yet after the great war so successfully ended. On two or three occasions during this session, when some men were inclined to be pessimestic, I took the optimistic view and I preached optimism on every possible occasion, but I never dreamt that I should win such converts to my way of thinking as would appear from the Government's action with regard to these estimates. I have also looked at the matter from another point of view and I have asked myself would any sane business man, after grave thought and deliberation, after considering the pros and cons, and after looking at the affairs of the country in a fair, unbiased way, have brought down these estimates and placed them before sane men and expect them to be passed without debate? Would any government with the slightest claim to political acumen place estimates like these before us? There is only one conclusion we can come to and that is the one I have arrived at and is expressed in the old saying "whom the gods destroy, they first make mad." I see the handwriting on the wall and we will soon see the end of this Government. The first shot will be fired on the 24th, when the electors of Bay de Verde will send Mr. Puddister back to this House with a big majority. I see the Hon. Minister of Justice taking notes and no doubt he will give me a broad side but if he does I hope I am sport enough to take my medicine. If I have hurt the feelings of any hon. gentlemen I am sorry for it. I am not speaking of them as individuals but as part of a machine—the Government. I am only going to speak briefly now but when the different votes come up I shall have more to say about them. I do not consider these increases equitable, nor do I think that the Government have sufficiently taken into consideration the recommendations of the Commission. Probably they have been guided somewhat by them but I think they have used their own discretion quite a bit. I believe, with the hon. member for St. George's, that the civil service is controlled to a certain extent by a political pull and I am sure that hon. gentlemen in this House will be glad to see the day when positions in the civil service will be obtainable only by competitive examination and then the poor man's son will get his chance. Any member bringing in a measure to give effect to this, whether he be on the Government or Opposition side of the House will have my hearty support. In dealing with the estimates I find that they are very interesting and I am sure that if the public get copies of them, they would stay up all night perusing them. Take page two, for ex-

ample, under the head of Civil Government, head A and we find that in the Government House there is an increase of 20%. The Department of the Prime Minister is given the modest increase of 116% and the Department of the Colonial Secretary gets a rise of 23% which is not so bad. The Department of the Minister of Justice is not so much out either, he gets the nice little increase of 70%. Now take the Department of Finance and Customs. There is nothing small about the grab the head of that department gets for his department, it is the same as the Prime Minister's, an increase of 116%. Probably I'd do the same thing myself if I were in his place. Then we come down to the Minister of Agriculture and Mines who gets a little increase of 70% for his department, while the Minister of Marine and Fisheries gets 60% for his department, he's somewhat behind. The Minister of Public Works is very modest, he only gets an increase of 42% for the Department of Public Works.

Take Public Charities for 1920 the vote was $719,470.21 and Public Charities for 1920-19121 is $931,299,-71, an increase of $211,829.50. Now sir the majority of the people reading this would say look what the Government has done for the orphans and widows, but do you think this increase helps out the widows and orphans; they have been allowed an additional $14,294.00 and now where is the rest of the money gone? Charitable institutions and salaries I presume, so far as any increase for the widows and orphans, the actual figures are only $14,294.00. Is this sir in keeping with the promises outlined in the manifesto of November last. Even the widows were given an assurance or at least an intimation that they would be given a pension the same as the men, but it doesn't look like it to-night. Let us bring this matter home to ourselves. How would we get on with 24 or 36 dollars per year and I think it is something in the vicinity of $24.00 that some of them get. How far would that go with the present high cost of living? The House is not inclined to listen to this I am thinking. That is why four of the Cabinet Ministers are absent from the House to-night. It is very bad taste to say the least of it for these men to be absent when the House is in committee of the whole on Supply. Does it mean that they are determined to railroad these estimates through this House in spite of our objections. It looks like it anyway. It would only be common courtesy to stay here and ltisten to our criticisms. Now while we are at this question of public charities I would like to draw the attention of the House to the Deputy Minister of that department, Mr. O'Dwyer. If he is a deputy is he not entitled to the increase that other deputies have received, namely $3600. Every man in this House knows that he is entitled to it, the Commission recommended it, and we know that he is the right man in the right place. He is as hard as nails when the occasion requires it but on the other hand when the claims put forward are just he attends to them, and I regret that he has not been placed on the same feeting as the other deputies. To carry out those estimates that are before the House tonight is going to be a question. I ask the Minister of Finance now in all sincerity if he is going to look forward to the coming years with hope and faith. The estimates this year call for a vote of $8,856,616.94. I would ask sir if you were doing a private business of this magnitude would you be prepared to go the limit as you are doing with the country's affairs. With reference to the increase in salaries I don't say that they do not deserve them. No man can put his increase to better advantage than I can but are we justi-

fied in giving those increases to ourselves and other officials and ignore those other poor people around the country and give no increase to old age pensions and practically none to widows and orphans. It is true that there has been a $10,000 vote for old age pensions but this will be given to other applicants waiting but not to increase present grant of $50, and that's on a par with what I said just now in relation to the widows and orphans. Why the pension to-day of $50 will not buy more than 2½ barrels of flour. Don't you think that the old men and women should get a share of what is going? High cost of living must bear heavily on their shoulders also. Those are the different views that we should consider before we pass these estimates as they are. I look down the list of couriers and nowhere can I find where any increase has been provided for them. After all they should look for an increase considering the price of hay and oats and harness and horses to-day. I think that they would be justified in asking for an increase. The high cost of living bears very harshly on them and I do not think it would be out of the way for them to ask for an increase. And what about the soldiers and sailors, I understand that their grant has been considerably decreased since last year. I cannot find where any provision has been made for the rependants of those men who gave their lives on the fields of Gallipoli and France so that we could live in peace at home. A very sad case came to my knowledge a few days ago. A woman came to me, she was here to see her 14 year old son who was in hospital and who was likely never to come out of it. Her boy had died in France and her husband was now laid up with rheumatism and a broken leg. When her boy died in France the father was A1 but has since been disabled, to-day he is unable to support his family. I think some provision should be made for cases like that. We should see that a sufficient sum of money was voted so that any father or mother or dependant of those who shed their blood for us will not be in want, and I throw out now the suggestion to the Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, and I hope he will bring the matter up before the Executive Government at an early date and see that these people are not neglected but provided for by a grateful country. This is not the only case brought to my notice. There is another: A man in my district over sixty years of age who went overseas. His son, the only son that he had unmarried, was killed. When this man came back he was boarded out of the regiment and he appeared to be alright, but after he was boarded out he became badly crippled with rheumatism. His plea for help was turned down, the same as the woman that I have just mentioned. Those are the things that are making trouble with the G.W.V.A. Then there is another question of allowances for uniforms. This may apply to the hon. and gallant gentleman on the other side of the House, Lieut. Small. I do not know when he was demobilised, but if he was demobilised on the 30th of July he forfeited one hundred dollars, but the other men who were demobilised in August drew one hundred dollars for kit allowance. This is another cause of complaint with the G.W.V.A., because they know that it is not a square deal. If these men who were demobilised on July 30th were not entitled to the same amount as the men who were demobilised in August, then at least, they should have got a proportionate share. That is only one of the many kicks that the soldiers have. Now, sir, I wish to suggest to the Hon. the Minister of Justice, the Hon. the Minsiter of Finance and Customs, Mr. Foote, and Mr. Barnes that

at the next meeting of the Executive Government they bring up this matter of providing for dependants of our fallen heroes where no provision already exists and see that it is given proper attention. I have no fault to find with the Board of Pension Commissioners, because they have to go by the rules laid down for them, which are hard and fast, but they should be given power of discrimination, in matters of this nature.

Now sir, we will take the question of lighthouses and signal stations. I find that for last year there was a vote of $185,854.65 and for the years 1920 and 1921 a vote of $210,771.39, an increase, mark you, of only $24,916.00. Now, what can be done with that increase in the establishment of lighthouses and signal stations along this coast. If the estimate I am reading is not correct, I would like to be told so, and be given an explanation. I am taking the figures laid down here, but the members on the other side of the House are looking at me, as much as to say that cannot be. This increase would not buy one light. Where is the money coming from to establish lighthouses that are being called for every day? Where is the money coming from to establish life saving stations? Where is the money coming from to provide whistling buoys, great aids to navigation, which you will see anywhere but in this country, but we are one hundred years behind the times? Go along the Cape Breton shore and down the coasts of Nova Scotia, coast of Maine, in the Irish Sea, the English Channel, the Bay of Biscay, and not away out in the ocean but along the coast you will see these whistling buoys, bell buoys and automatic whistling and light buoys and all kinds of aids to navigation. If some of the money that we have squandered in the past few years on foolish votes were spent in equipping a light saving station near Cape Race perhaps many of the people lost on the Florizel would be alive to-day. I went through that experience and I know what I am talking about, and I made up my mind then that at every opportunity that offered I would do my utmost to see that more aids to navigation be furnished. What we want and what I think we will get from what the Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries stated is another Directional Wireless Station, there is one now at Cape Race. If we had one at Cape Chapau Rouge in Placentia Bay or one at Signal Hill or Cape Spear there is no reason why we should have any more tragedies, provided steamers exercised due caution, and were equipped with wireless. It is one of the greatest inventions of the age, and we should not hesitate to allocate the necessary money for that station, either at Cape Spear, Signall Hill or elsewhere.

Next we come to the vote for roads and bridges. I find that in 1919 and 1920 $197,714.50 was voted, and for 1920 and 1921 the vote is $221,606.50, an increase for roads on our main line of $23,892.10, a very small increase sir, when you consider that wages has gone up 300%, and at the time when we could get men to work for eighty cents a day, the main line grant was not sufficient to keep the roads in repair, not to talk of extending them. What roads are in my district are nothing better than cow-paths. Then again, look at the cost of lumber for bridges, hardware, nails, etc. The roads are no good now and they will go down and get worse unless we can give more financial assistanee to local roads and our main lines than is provided for in the estimates before us now.

I see sir, that in 1919 and 1920 the amount voted for Contingencies was ten thousand dollars, and for 1920 and 1921 the amount voted is fifty thou-

sand dollars. There will have to be some explanation for that increase.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—While there was only ten thousand dollars voted for Contingencies last year, there was one hundred and fifty or sixty thousand spent.

MR. SULLIVAN:—I regret to hear that sir, but I am sure that the Minister will appreciate that this isall I have to go by, I mean the estimates tabled by the Hon. Minister of Finance, and I notice that last year there was ten thousand voted and this year there is fifty thousand dollars voted. Surely I am not out of order in asking for an explanation of this big increase.

It is a most interesting study going down through these estimates. We find a little further on another vote for additional estimates. We had the same vote last year. I am not blaming you for putting it under the same heading. For 1919 and 1920 the vote was seventy-nine thousand three hundred dollars. This year in keeping with all the other increases it is one hundred and twenty-six thousand six hundred dollars, an increase of forty-three thousand six hundred dollars. This, sir, is like the contingency account, and when the proper time comes I want an explanation of why that big increase is voted for additional estimates this year. We can vote forty-three thousand three hundred dollars for this purpose and only the small sum of fourteen or fifteen thousand dollars for the relief of widows and orphans, :t does not seem quite fair does it?

Another vote here I would like an explanation of from the Prime Minister is the vote for pensions of soldiers and sailors. In 1919 and 1920 this vote was six hundred and fifty-six thousand dollars. This year it is down to five hundred and two thousand five hundred dollars, a reduction of one hundred and forty-three thousand dollars. I would like to know why it is. Is it that the men who drew pensions last year have died, or are not receiving them any longer or what other reason is there for this reduction?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—I couldn't tell the hon. gentleman.

MR. SULLIVAN:—I presume that the Hon. the Prime Minister will be able to explain the matter. I wish he were here now, and I would ask him. I expect he will be here when the Bay de Verde election is over. For 1920-21 there is an increase in civil government of $289,643. I want you outport members on the Government side to remember those figures. I know that salaries have gone up 20%, but we also know that a lot of salaries have been increased 100%.

MR. SAMSON:—You cannot say that they lost time.

MR. HIGGINS:—You can say that you like $1000 better than $200.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Here is something interesting to us all. For 1919-20 it took for Legislation $36,325.25; this year $77,358.12, a nincrease of $38,849.25. This is not altogether made up of salaries to members of the House, but a part of it, and I do not see why members of this House should not be given a decent sessional pay, beacuse I consider any man who represents an outport district and has to come in to St. John's earns it and should be entitled to it. But are we justified in voting ourselves first? I want the money, perhaps, as much as any man in this House, but I ask myself that question, in view of the condition of things in this country, and the other demands upon the Government. Are we justified in voting that big increase and others in the Government receiving only 20% of an increase and some others getting no increase at all? That is the question for this House to decide and this

House should not be afraid to face the burden and decide it. There are some increases and some decreases made. I made a note of them as they struck me. For instance the messenger in the Public Works Department. He had a salary of $885.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—That is not his salary.

MR. SULLIVAN:—I am not a thought-reader. I am going by what is in the estimates. On Page 11 the salary of the messenger was down last year for $885. I thought he was reduced $100, but now I see he is reduced $185 and is to get $700 this year. When the vote for this department is being discussed in Committee I shall ask for an explanation as to why this man was cut, when, according to the Commissioners report, there was a general increase owing to the high cost of living.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Who is this man?

MR. SULLIVAN:—I could not tell you.

MR. HIGGINS:—Some one told me that this man would not go to Bay de Verde for the Government. I understand that that is the reason.

MR. SULLIVAN:—In those estimates I have not seen any provision made for increased coastal service and I am afraid that there is no provision made for any additional coastal contracts or no provision made for our transportation problem. I do not think that there will be very much left to attend to these matters out of our nine millions of dollars of revenue, even if we do have a banner year next year.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—We will have more revenue than that.

MR. SULLIVAN:—I am glad to hear that statement, but I really cannot become reconciled with it, in view of the present high cost of living. I would like to know if the Budget will disclose any heavier taxation.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSOMS:—Reduction.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Well, if reduction, then you cannot get more than nine millions of dollars of revenue. You have got to tax some one if you anticipate a revenue of nine millions that is a certainty. There is another matter that I would like to refer to and that is the unfairness of those increases. I see that the President of the Upper House is to get $500, poor man, he needs it. Another poor man up there in that Chamber is the Leader of the Government, who also is booked for $500. Now then I ask you why does not the Speaker of this House get an increase from $750; the Chairman of Committees, the clerks, the solicitor, the pages, the door-keepers and the Sergeant-at-Arms. Does not the high cost of living bear heavily on their shoulders? The amount voted for the printing of debates in the Upper House last year was $900; this year it is $1300, a nice increase. But that is not the main point. Last year we voted $2200 for the publishing of debates; this year there is an increase of $400. The paper that they are printed on is sold at pre-war prices and the labour in the handling of that paper is not gone up enough to warrant such an increase. I know that the prices of telephones and stationery will astound some of the members of the late administration. For the House of Assembly it is $1500 this year; last year it was exactly half that amount. I am sure when the explanation is forthcoming that it will make interesting reading. Now if you will look at page seven, under the head of Civil Government, take the Colonial Secretary's Department and notice what the salary of the third clerk is. I give you my word of honour I do not know who that gentleman is. Last year he had $1260

and this year he is to receive $1200, a substantial increase, no doubt. I am very sorry that the Colonial Secretary is not here so as we could get an explanation of that. These are questions that I would like to see cleared up. There seems to have been a wave struck the Colonial Secretary's Department. I find that the fourth clerk last year got $900; this year he is down for $750.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—This is on account of Mr. Butt having been transferred to the Department of Education to keep the accounts there.

MR. HIGGINS:—A good man. This is the foundation of this department, I presume.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—There is a little credit due us. There is a re-arrangement in the Colonial Secretary's office. There was really no fourth clerk in that department last year.

MR. SULLIVAN:—I regret that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not here so as I could deal with the vote for that department. There is a new vote for a herring inspector. I find that two typewriters were put in there at $720 each. Provision is also made for a superintendent of marine construction at a salary of $1500. This is a new vote. I see that the Superintendent of Fisheries is to get $5000. Well the Minister told us about that vote when we were discussing the standardization of fish bill. I understand that the fees coming out of the tax on exportation of fish will help to pay that salary. These are only some of the figures for that Department. Some of them have gone up considerably more than we were led to believe. Take the Department of the Government Engineer. I presume that department comes under the Colonial Secretary's Department. I notice that the position of masonry superintendent is down for $1620. I would like to ask what that means.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—We did not appoint any masonry superintendent.

MR. SULLIVAN:—We ought to make a vote for it. What is tabled in this House is the only information we are supposed to have. There is no masonry superintendent appointed, we are told, although the vote for one is here as $1200. Then again there is a new vote for rolling stock inspector. I notice under the heading of Assessor's Department, a travelling auditor appointed with $1800 salary and no doubt travelling expenses are included somewhere also.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—That was made by the late Government.

MR. SULLIVAN:—I am not supposed to know.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Sure the hon. member read it last year.

MR. SULLIVAN:—I was not in the country when the House was in session last year. It is quite simple to cut in and say that this vote was there last year, but not give us a copy of Supplemental Supply, so as we can see where we are.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Mr. Hibbs 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 to-morrow.

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

And it now being past twelve of the clock, midnight.

The House adjourned until this afternoon at three of the clock.

SATURDAY, June 19th, 1920.

The House met pursuant to adjournment.

HON. MINISTER OF EDUCATION:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the district of Harbor Grace asking that the sum of $800.00 be granted them for the replacement of a bridge which has recently fallen down.

Committee of the Whole on Supply.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Mr. Chairman, when the House adjourned this morning I was dealing with some new salaries that the House had been asked to vote. I had placed the matter squarely and fairly before the Opposition and Government. I do not wish to debate any longer under the present existing conditions. Practically every head of departments with the exception of the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Education is absent from this House. We have absent to-day the Prime Minister and Colonial Secretary who is also taking the place of the Minister of Militia under whose department we are asked to vote the sum of five or six thousand dollars for pensions. We have also absent the Minister of Marine and Fisheries under whose department we are also asked to vote a very large increase. We have also absent the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs whose department also calls for a large increase and some new votes for salaries that the Minister of Finance has told us he is not prepared to explain. What the votes were required for he was not able to explain except in so far as his own department was concerned. I think, sir, that under these circumstances it would be only right and decent to adjourn the debate on these estimates until such time as the ministers who are absent are able to come here and tell us why we are asked to vote the different sums for their departments. So far as it appears at present they cannot come here until after the Bay de Verde election. Let us get together right now and adjourn this House and let whoever wants to go to Bay de Verde go. While speaking last night I didn't anticipate that we would be called here to-day and find the same ministers who were absent then would be absent to-day from this House. So far it is not likely that any of these Cabinet Ministers will be here until next week and it is time for us who are not Cabinet Ministers on both sides of this House to protest against this obstruction. They claim that we are obstructionists but we have done nothing in the way of obstruction since the opening week of the House. We are not sent here to be dummies and I want the members of this House to understand that we don't intend to be. If the business of this House is going to be carried on in the slipshod way that it has been carried on in the past few weeks then there is not much likelihood of closing up for some time. If the men on the other side of the House who are present to-day have any influence with the Government they should use it to see that these ministers come here. The Minister of Finance should be able to tell us all about these estimates. I think he has made a great mistake in not making some explanation of the estimates on presenting them. They are the only facts we have to go on. We don't know what supplementary supply was last year. I was told last night that I should know, but it is not my fault if I did not as I was not in the country. How do I know what such and such a man received last year? I would be very glad if some member on the other side of the House would propose that we

adjourn until the cabinet ministers have returned.

That is not good enough. People have waited here two weeks and have had to go home at the end of that time. Mr. Walsh stated, and I presume that he had good authority, that there are at least eight hundred people waiting for admission to the General Hospital. If this statement can be substantiated, then sir, I say that it is time for this House to wake up, and it is time for this Government to wake up, and provide some facilities for treating the sick people of the country. Mr. Walsh jus ttells me that there is a boy here named Walters from Boat Hr., Placentia Bay, who has been waiting three or four weeks for admission to the General Hospital. Now then how can we overcome this congestion. There are one or two ways by which this congestion can be overcome. We all recognize the fact that there is only one hospital in the country outside of a small one in Grand Falls. Well, then surely the Government knows this as well as I do. They know that this congestion is getting worse year after year. Why did not the Government in bringing in the Estimates make some provision for this in a small way at least by voting sums of money for outport hospitals in the capitals of the principal districts. That would relieve the congestion to a large extent. Another thing that I hear criticised from time to time is that there is no charge made in the General Hospital for treatment, and as a result of that, when a patient gets in there, it is impossible to get him out of it. Now, sir, an arrangement should be arrived at whereby a patient who is able to should be made pay for the treatment he has received. There are a good many people in the city to-day and many in the outports who would be glad to pay for the attention they receive in hospital, but according to the way things are now they are not allowed to pay anything for treatment at the General Hospital. This is not business! It is not sensible I know that there are lots of worthy people who are not in a position to pay for the tattendance they receive, but that is where the Government should step in. The hospital should receive payment directly either form the individual or from the State, and until some plan along these lines is introduced, and we have those outport hospitals established, we will have the same conditions at the General Hospital as we have to-day. How many people in St. John's to-day, people who are well off or in the outports would be glad to go down and take a private room, if they could get one. They have two or three private rooms down there, and if you book one two years ahead, you might be able to get in. Why not build a wing on to the hospital with private rooms, and charge people who can pay it five or six dollars a day, as they do in other countries. If you want to make a poorhouse of the hospital go ahead as you are doing, but if you want to make people who go there feel independent, introduce a system that will enable them to pay for the treatment they receive there. So much for that. I trust, sir, that the few remarks I have made here will bear fruit, and that the Executive Government will exert themselves to formulate a system along the lines I have suggested.

Now we come to the Postal Telegraph vote. All through the campaign I was a great advocate of the extension of the telegraph or telephone system. I might say that I have a preference for the telephone. My contention is that we should have central telegraph office and telephone feeding lines from all the offices around our districts, because you know, and I know, that although we have established telegraph offices all around the country that there

is not the slightest chance of many of these becoming a paying proposition, but if the telephone system was inaugurated and connections were made with a central telegraph office, or with a post office, that we would be able to reduce considerably our salary vote for the outports of the whole country. We could use the slot system. I am aware that the salaries operators have been receiving for a number of years have been very small. Even in the old days when living was cheap they could barely exist upon them, and that there is a very good reason for the increases that have been made to officials of the Postal Telegraph Department all over the country, but I do not consider that they have been made in the proper way. They have not all been made on merit, and before I close here this evening I hope to show instances of increases that have been made to officials in this department that should not have been made, and also to point out some cases where increases should have been given and have not been given. Now sir, I come to the vote in the estimates for the General Post Office. Last year we were asked to vote $16,330.62 and this year an increase of $16,728.00 under this head. I would like to ask the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs for an explanation, I would like to ask him why the vote asked is not considerably more, because it is only a small increase under the circumstances of six or seven thousand dollars. If the Minister is not here to give a reply to the question, then is there any gentleman on the other side of the House prepared to answer my question. Perhaps the Minister of Finance might be able to explain?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—The only thing I can tell you is that was all was asked for.

MR. SULLIVAN:—You must agree with me, sir, that it is a most unsatisfactory state of affairs for us to be asked to pass these estimates without getting a reasonable explanation of them.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—That is the only explanation I can give you.

MR. SULLIVAN:—There must be some explanation. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the Minister of Finance to move that the Committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again at alater date.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—We have not come to the Postal Telegraph vote yet in the estimates, and when we do, the Minister will be here to answer any questions put to him. Does the hon. member propose to make any further remarks on the matter?

MR. SULLIVAN:—I have considerably more to say yet.

MR. MacDONNELL:—I think that the hon. member asked the Hon. the Minister of Finance to raise the Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—The Minister of Finance and Customs won't raise the Committee.

MR. MacDONNELL:—I am glad to see the Hon. the Minister of Justice taking charge in this House. Personally I think he should have had charge long ago, and I am glad to see that he is coming into his own at last.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Well, then so much for that vote. No explanation. Next we come to the vote for St. John's offices. Last year the vote was $38,591.52. This year we are asked to vote $56,692.40, an increase of $16,980.88. I presume that that is to be made up in increased salaries to officials in offices in St. John's. No doubt those increases are deserved, but are they allocated properly? Are they allocated on merit, or is the amount allocated regulated by the amount of pull the man may have? I am not

making this charge. I am asking for information. As the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs is absent from the House I will have to wait for an answer and it will only mean repeating the whole thing at a later date.

The next item is Travelling Post Offices. Last year this House was asked to vote $38,157.91 for this purpose. This year we are asked to vote $54,-888.00, or an increase this year over last year for Travelling Post Offices of $16,731.91. This seems to be a large increase for Travelling Post Offices. There are not so many in the country. There are probably six on the railroad and six or eight on steamers. This appears to be an increase of $1500.00 for each Travelling Post Office. I don't for a moment think that the Executive Government would pass so substantial an increase as this, but what is one to believe? Here we are asked to vote an increase of nearly seventeen thousand dollars for Travelling Post Offices, and there is no explanation given. In going down through the estimates, under the heading of rents, I find that rent for Postal Telegraph Department, have gone up from five to seven thousand dollars annually. This will require some explanation. I do not know whether or not the General Post Office is built on Crown Lands or leasehold land, if the latter we should have a 99 years lease of it; but if this increased two thousand dollars does not apply to the G. P.O. building, I would like to know for what rent it is required to meet. Coming down the list under postal contingencies I find, sir, that this grant has been increased from $25,000 last year to $40,000 this year. Surely, sir, when we are asked to vote an extra $15,000 for contingencies we should receive some explanation for it. I say that it is an absurdity to dispose of the estimates without the necessary information and explanations at our disposal. I repeat that it is bad taste, to say the least of it, for Ministers and Heads of Departments who are asking for exorbitant increases in their respective salaries that they should not be here to give us the reasonable information which we ask and which the country desires to know. Speaking of uniforms, surely, sir, the cost of uniforms have not increased 100% since last session. It is quite possible that they have increased during the war to that extent. Last year this House voted $4,000 for uniforms for the Postal Departments. This year we are asked to vote $8,000. With the crying needs throughout the country to-day and such calls from old worn out fishermen and from the dependents of those who went Overseas and fought for us, I think that we are quite within our rights in asking for the fullest information possible in connection with these estimates. We now come to another very interesting topic, that of steam subsidies. Last year this House voted $605,078.25; this year we are asked to vote $715,378.25, an increase of $110,300.00. We would like to know where that substantial increase is going to be spent. I have particulars of some of the increases. I might say that the districts I represent is badly in need of further coastal facilities and I contend that if we are going to vote this big sum for coastal subsidies, that I want my share for the district of Placentia and St. Mary's. I will show this House where part of this vote is going to be diverted and then members can judge for themselves if their districts are getting a square deal. Under the heading of General Maintenance I find a big increase and I would like an explanation as to what this big increase is asked for. Last year there was voted $206,065.91; this year $301,-091.15, an increase for maintenance alone of $95,025.24. After all, there is nothing very unreasonable in asking

why this large increase is required. Possibly there may be some good explanation. If there is I will be glad to receive it and my colleagues and the other members on this side of the House will be glad to receive it. Under the heading, Postal Telegraphs, construction and repairs to main line; last year $22,000 was voted; this year we are asked to vote exactly the same amount. I would like to know what is the explanation for this. We all know that the cost of construction must have gone up and we know that the cost of telegraph poles and wires cost considerably more to-day than they did and if those items have gone up in accordance with others, it is only right and proper for this House to increase last year's vote proportionately. Now is the time to have that vote properly dealt with and not have it brought in under contingencies. I understand that it is the intention of the Government to bring in one vote covering everything that is required. Last year the vote for Marconi royalties $4,637; this year we are asked to increase that vote to $20,000. I move that the Committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. HIGGINS:—I understood that the main idea of sitting this afternoon was to meet the Governor.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—If Mr. Sullivan is finished we will adjourn. I understood he would finish by five o'clock.

MR. HIGGINS:—I do not think that Mr. Sullivan will be finished at that hour.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Well then Mr. Sullivan may go on until five o'clock.

MR. SULLIVAN:—I am now, sir, discussing the Marconi royalties. Last year the vote asked for under this heading was four thousand six hundred and thirty-seven dollars. This year it has been increased to two thousand dollars, an increase of four hundred and and fifty per cent. The thing may be all right but on the face of it it does not look right and surely there must be some good reason, some explanation why this vote is asked for. I regret that the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs is not here in his seat to-day to answer these questions and give us the information which is ours by right. Now sir, I come a little further down and find a very large amount asked for. We are asked here to vote under the heading of the Anglo-American tax the sum of seventy thousand dollars. I can see no vote in last year's estimates of a similar nature. Why is this seventy thousand dollars voted? Might I ask the Minister of Finance for the information?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—What is the use of giving you an explanation when you will not accept it?

MR. SULLIVAN:—I will accept it.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—You have not accepted any information I have given you.

MR. SULLIVAN:—You cannot say that. When have I doubted your veracity?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—This amounte is voted to pay the Anglo-American Company for last year's bill for sending through our messages. We did not then have the line open at Port aux Basques.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Well that is very satisfactory. This amount of seventy thousand was put in the estimates without an explanation and it is not strange to ask why it is voted. Well, sir, some of the members of the Government were not in here when I referred to this vote of seventy thousand dollars which we are asked to vote for the Anglo-American cable tax and some of them may be in the same position as I was. They probably knew why this amount was voted or selse they would have been in here to re-

ceive the information of the Finance Minister. Under the heading Wireless Telegraph Construction we are asked to vote the sum of ten thousand dollars. I have nothing to say against that because I am an advocate for establishing around our coast extra wireless stations and small wireless stations to connect up the islands where it is not feasible to lay a cable. But we should know where and how this ten thousand dollars are going to be spent. I would like to know if any part of that amount is to be used in connecting up the island of Oderin and Flat Islands with the mainland in the district of Burin because after all it is only reasonable for the members for the district to like to have their share of the givings out for the district they represent. Otherwise they are not doing their duty to their constituents. When we go back for re-election whenever that will be, they will not be able to say that the present members for Placentia and St. Mary's did not get their share or did not look for their fair share of what was going for the district. And it is my policy since elected and I intend to keep it up as long as I represent Placentia and St. Mary's on the floors of this House. Now, sir, I am going to deal briefly with some increases which have been made under the heading of Civil Government. As I have been discussing the Department of Posts and Telegraphs I might continue on and deal with the officials there. I am saying that those increases that have been voted are excessive or otherwise. What I would like to know and have is an explanation of those increases. With the high cost of living as it is I do not fear for one moment that there is any danger of this Government or any other Government giving the officials of the civil service more than is absolutely necessary. And all they will be given under the present living conditions will be only enough to exist upon but what by the way is the reason for those increases.

We are told that the late Government appointed a Commission to recommend certain increases in the Civil Service. That may be so or not. I have been told that the late Government appointed a commission to enquire into and report upon the salaries of the civil servants with a view to increasing some if it was found that they were deserving of increases. That statement which I have is made by me in all sincerity. I never saw the copy handed the Commissioners. I have been told that the late Government approved of a twenty per cent increase all round in the civil service. If that be so I am at a loss to understand why that twenty per cent did not go into effect. It has gone into effect according to the estimates in some cases. In other cases the increases range from seventy per cent to one hundred per cent. Is the late Government responsible for those increases which I have referred to. If they are I do not want to take any of the blame for them. Every member of the civil service who merits promotion should get it. And as I said last night we will never have a satisfactory civil service until such time that one cannot enter it but on the basis of competitive examination. Now for the heading Superintendent of the Money Order Office. The vote last year was fifteen hundred dollars and this year it is twenty-one hundred and sixty. That is considerably more than twenty per cent increase. I presume there is some good reason or that amount would not be there. Why sir, this man is getting an increase of six hundred and sixty dollars.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—That is not correct.

MR. SULLIVAN:—May I ask for an explanation?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—

Last year when the estimates were tabled by the then Minister of Finance the gentleman referred to by the honourable member for Placentia was stipulated to receive fifteen hundred dollars. The Commission appointed by the late Government to enquire into the salaries during the summer made certain recommendations for increases. In 1920 there were increases given by the Government as follows: one thousand dollars, thirty per cent; two thousand dollars, twenty per cent increase and three thousand dollars fifteen per cent increase. It was assumed that a certain number of individuals for whom recommendations for increases were made by the Commission would not receive it until after the general election. There was a certain part of the service which forced the hands of the Government to do so before they intended and these people were the telegraph operators of the country. The gentleman to whom the honourable member referred received under last year's estimates a salary of fifteen hundred dollars and previous to our taking over the Government he received the twenty per cent increase which brought his salary up to eighteen hundred dollars. So under the present estimates he has received an increase of three hundred and sixty dollars instead of six hundred and sixty.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Was that increase made after the Commission reported?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—I may say that the increase was granted after the Commission reported to them. Those were the ones who were doing the work and as you say they are entitled to it.

MR. SULLIVAN:—I now come to first clerk of the Money Order Office. He was voted last year twelve hundred and sixty dollars. This year he is down for seventeen hundred and twenty-eight dollars. If this clerk is entitled to it because of his work that is satisfactory to me. I would like to ask the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs why is it that the postmasters in the outports only got an increase of twenty per cent? What is the explanation of that? Have we not as good officials in the outports as in the city? I suppose they have no friends on the other side and they are forgotten about. People are not treated alike, and if you haven't the pull and if you don't get out and fight and shout for the Government, you are going to be left behind, and that's what's happening to-day. Here we find the outport postmasters and postmistresses getting an increase of 20%. Now what is 20% added to the miserable pittances they received before. Again take the couriers, I have gone thru the whole list and I have not been able to find a single increase for a courier. Does not the high cost of living lean as hard on these people as on the heads of departments; you are making fish of one and flesh of another. I notice that steam subsidies have been increased but there is no provision for adequate service in Placentia and St. Mary's District. Bay of Islands is provided for then why not Placentia and St. Mary's, what is the explanation? Like many of the other questions asked here, it is unanswerable. The subsidy for Bell Island last year was $3400, this year we are asked to vote $6000. In connection with steam subsidies, I can see where a big slice is going. There was no vote last year for Fogo District, this year we are asked to vote $40,000. Labrador North gets a vote of $30,000, surely that cannot be right? And the North East Coast which had $45,000 last year now gets $50,000. The vote for the South and West Coasts last year was $38,000, this year we are asked to increase it to $50,000. I would like to know how that extra $12,000 is going to be spent.

Fortune Bay District had $20,000, this year the vote is $40,000, and so we have Fogo, Fortune Bay, Labrador North, the N. E. Coast and parts of the South and West Coast with big increases in their subsidies, and I repeat there is not vote for Placentia and St. Mary's. This is not playing the game. We need more bay and coastal boats on that big district and if there are going to be givings out they are as much entitled to it as any other district. I am sorry the Minister responsible for the vote is not in the House because I consider that St. Mary's Bay is cut off from every service. There is the Portia, it is true, but the western part of the bay is entirely cut off from everything and I would like to see something done to remedy this. We see a small steamer like the Argyle placed on Placentia Bay but she is not able to cope with the traffic there and another steamer is required but so far nothing has been done and altho these people contribute their share to the revenues the Government turns a deaf ear to their requests and they derive no benefit from the votes of money now asked for, part of which comes out of their pockets. Now sir, another matter that I will deal with is the Telegraph vote. The central staff at St. John's had $50,031.50. This year we are asked to vote an increase of $21,-848.60, making a total of $71,373.10. The outport operators have also got a considerable increase but I shall only refer to some of them. These increases are not carried out in an equitable way, some offices have been given large increases while others get none, and the same thing applies to the messengers. Now what is the explanation for this? Why are not all treated alike? In looking over the list the first office that takes my eye is Port au Port where the lime quarries are situated. The vote for that office last year was $405, this year it is $480, an increase of practically 20%.

Now take the next one, Anderson's Cove,, where it is I don't know, but last year the vote was $225, this year it is $420, an increase of $195. Badger office last year was $585, this year it is 749.60, an increase of $176.-60. Bay Bulls last year was $300, now it is $420, an increase of $120. Bay de Verde last year was $187.50, not very much you will admit for anyone to exist on but now it is $420, an increase of $232.50. Now why is this so, why this descrimination? Some offices get an increase of $120, others get $315, and so on. Bell Island for example was $885 last year, now it is $1200. For the life of me I cannot see on what basis these increases are made up.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—The explanation is that as a result of the telegraphers' strike last year no operator was to be paid less than $420.

MR. SULLIVAN:—That explanation isquite satisfactory, but why not the messengers get a share of the rise? I see here that the messenger at Bell Island got $147 last year and this year the vote is the same. Now take the operator at Black Head, last year the vote was $295, this year it is $420, that is alright. For Bonne Bay the vote last year was $691.80, this year it is $1200, an increase of $608.20; I suppose there is an explanation for that, tho the strike cannot be responsible for it. Perhaps the Minister of Finance can give me an explanation?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—I cannot.

MR. SULLIVAN:—I am sure I cannot understand it.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—You have my sympathy.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Cape Race operator last year got $405, this year the vote is $540, a little over 20% increase. Now why should not a man

or a woman at a place like Cape Race, a lonely headland, get a decent salary. Catalina vote was $450 last year, this year it is $840, an increase of $300; got the pull evidently. Change Islds. is even worse, the vote for that office last year was $337, this year it is $840, a nincrease of $503. Don't you think, sir, we are justified in asking why these increases are made. Why should this man get such an increase while another in some office where there is double the work gets none? Simply because the other man happens to be on the wrong side of politics he gets the increase. Now we come to the office at Come By Chance, in the District of Placentia and St. Mary's. The operator there is a Trinity Bay man. The lady who was in that office was discharged to make room for him, he is a returned soldier. The lady in question belongs to the district and her father was line repairer for twenty years, but no sooner was the present Government returned to power than she was discharged. However that is not the point I want to draw attention to. The vote for this office last year was $691.80 and it is the same this year. Why not increase this man's salary? It is a repeating station and the man is a returned soldier. I wish someone on the other side, in the absence of the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs would give me an explanation of this. I would like to ask the hon. member for Fortune and the hon. member for Burin, Mr. Foote, to see that this man's salary is increased proportionately with others.

MR. MacDONNELL:—Mr. Chairman, I said last night that we might expect some comment from The Star as proof of what was going to happen to-day we are sandbagged and bludgeoned in this Government newspaper. The article I refer to was written by John T. Meaney, the man who was sandbagged out of the district which he was contesting. This man has never stopped a chance to jump on me and there is no question about it that as long as we submit to this journalistic thuggery we are going to get it. Already one member of The Star has been driven out of this House and has never come here since as a reporter. This man was Mr. English. We are asked here to give our best co-operation for the passage of bills and there is sent here to-day journalistic assassins of this type to criticise. Take this article in The Star of yesterday. It starts with the heading in bold black type "Cashin Cuts Loose." Fair comment indeed sir. There are those who are writing these articles who should have been cut long ago and I say cut advisedly, it would have been better for the morality of the country. "Leader of the Opposition in Vulgar Abuse and Profanity." This sir, is a reflection upon Mr. Hibbs. This House has the highest regard for Mr. Hibbs as Chairman and absolute belief in his fairness and either the statement that profanity was permitted in this House is true or it is false. Are we in this House to withhold the debates. Because Mr. Halfyard received an S.O.S. call and went to Bay de Verde and because Mr. Coaker is at the present time making arrangements so that he can be in Bay de Verde on Monday must we refrain from debate. The Government is held responsible for this cowardly attack of literary assassins sent to this House for no other purpose than to sandbag their opponents. I know what other members of this House think about it. It has no effect upon me. We can expect to receive nothing better from the hands of such men and every word of condemnation from them is a word of praise. Mudslinging from such men has no effect upon us and that kind of newspaper stuff will not prevent me from giving my honest and candid

opinion. I put it to the chairman yesterday whether anything said was unfair.

Sir Michael Cashin gave notice of question.

MR. MOORE:—In seconding the motion for adjournment I will not delay the adjournment of the House more than a minute as I have a matter that I want to bring to the notice of the Government. Yesterday I called down at the Military Hospital where a nephew of mine is. He was operated on on the 13th April, 1918, and is suffering from wounds received in France in 1916. I ask Mr. Small, the gallant member for Burgeo and LaPoile, to drop down at that hospital this evening and see it. It is nothing but a sink of dirt and the food they get is not fit to eat. I am referring to the hospital down at the Grenfell Institute. On enquiring as to the condition of the food I found that the doctors there can't help it, the soup they get is cold and unfit to drink. There's one poor chap there who asked Mr. Sullivan to have me call in there and see him. That chap has been in hospital for two years and he has a wife and child. They are living in a house where they have to pay ten dollars per month out if his allowance of $30.00. He asked me to have him taken out of the place. The patients there are cold and shivering. The heat is off and the attendants down there say the manager Mr. Jones went off to England and didn't leave any orders to have a fire. The floors and walls are black and filthy and dirty, this is not right treatment and the Minister of Militia should look after it.

Mr. Walsh gave notice of question.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bills sent up entitled respectively—"An Act Respecting Licenses to Cut Hard Woods" and, "An Act to amend The St. John's Pilotage Act" without amendment.

The House then adjourned till three of the clock on to-morrow.

TUESDAY, June 22nd, 1920.

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

Mr. Walsh asked Hon. the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs to place on the table of the House a copy of the original report of Mr. Knight the Commissioner appointed by the Government in 1916-17 to inquire into matters in connection with the department of Postal Telegraphs.

MR. HIGGINS:—In the absence of Mr. Walsh I ask that this be held over.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—This report has already been tabled.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Asked the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries if Lt.-Col. Bernard is appointed Trade Comissioner for Newfoundland outide the Colony, and if so where and at what salary.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I ask that that stand over.

HON. SIR M. P. CASHIN:—You retain it on the Order Paper?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Yes.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Mr. Chairman, when this House adjourned on Saturday I was dealing with new salaries and increases far in excess of what the supposed big increases in the civil service and far in excess of what the Commission is supposed to

have recommended. I will deal to-day in the finish with the interest on the public debt. I notice that last year this House was asked to vote $2,088,224.81, and this year we are asked to vote $2,201,212.01, an increase on intercharges of $112,887.20. a very large increase indeed when you consider the present outlook of conditions in this country. This is not all; there are other large Supplementary estimates and contingencies to be brought in at a later date. In dealing, Sir, with some of the increases I especialy mentioned the case of the messenger at the Public Works Office. I did not know the name of the man in question the last time I refered to it but since then I learned that he was Mr. Thos. Lockyer. I thought messengers only received $885.00 and that this was decreased to $700.00, and I think that this is bad enough when you consider the high cost of living today, but now that I find that his salary has been cut down from $1100 to $700 I say that he is being persecuted. If he is no good and not worth the money get rid of him, but if he is good pay him. He is no friend of mine but I believe in giving every man in the Civil Service a square deal, and, if you are going to keep them there, don't do it on a pittance.

Now we come to the big crowd—the select crowd—the crowd with the pull. The first name on the list is His Excelency the Governor. His salary has been increased from $14,375.-00 with expenses to $15,000.00 and increased expense vote as well I expect.

The Prime Minister's salary last year was $3,450.00, this year it is $4,000.00. The Colonial Secretary, Minister of Justice, Minister of Finance, Minister of Agriculture, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and Minister of Public Works were receiving $2,400 last year. This year they are getting $4,000.00. A very nice increase indeed and very acceptable to the Hon. gentlemen I am sure.

Twenty per cent increase is allowed to Departmental Heads who were allowed forty-seven per cent already or sixty-seven per cent altogether. After all, there is an old saying that runs something like this: "A man should christen his own child first." Perhaps you are not to blame, but there is a day of reckoning coming and before the House meets again the financial condition of the country may have a different aspect about it than it has to-day. Anyway when this Government wil have to face the electorate again, if I am any judge, they will go back in fear and trembling when they have to give an account of their stewardship. I see that the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs is increased to $4,000. He is down for $3500 last year, although that Department was not in existence last year. Why this is so, I am at a loss to know. Again, we have the Minister of Education slated for a $4,000 sa. ary. N wonder the Minister looks over with a cheerful expression on his face. I would probably smile too, with that amount coming to me. And I see that the Auditor General is increased from $2400 to $3600. Well, if the other Deputy Heads are worthy of this rise, I presume he is. What strikes me again with reference to a remark I made on last Friday night is why is it that the Commissioner of Public Charities, Mr. O'Dwyer, has not received this increase to his salary, and why the discrimination? Getting back to the Public Works Depart ment over which Mr.Jennings has control, I find that we are asked to increase the vote practically 100 per cent for the members of the Board of

Works. There are six men now on the Board of Works. Last year $750 was voted for the members; this year we are asked to vote double that amount. I think, Sir, that I was justified in my remarks a few days ago when I stated that the Executive Government must have taken a very rosy view of things indeed when they increased votes by 100 per cent. I will now step from the Public Works Department to the Agriculture and Mines Department. I see here a vote for $5000. It is a new vote, and that vote I endorse, because long ago we should have a thoroughly up-to-date and No. 1 Geologist, and I may say that we could not expect to get a No. 1 man to come here for less than that amount; and the quicker that this country votes a sufficient sum of money for a Geological Surveyor the better it will be for the country. If you are going to bring in a good man from outside for that position, get him, even at $10,000 a year, and I will support him. I find that the Government Analyst is increased from $2445 to $3800. I have nothing to say against that vote. I understand that Mr. Davies is a very good man, but I would like to know what he is doing away, and if he is away on Government business, as he is badly needed here now with a load of moonshine coming in every other day and a lot of liquor seizures. He should be here to test the stuff.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE.—You do not want an analyst to test that.

MR. HIGGINS.—We would all volunteer for that job.

MR. SULLIVAN.—In the Government Engineer's office I find that the chief cderk was drawing $997. For a chief clerk that was a small salary but I see that it is gone up this year to $1729. I consider that that man was badly paid in the first place, but you have no business to give him a jump like that in one shot. The Government Engineer I place in the same category as the Geologist. That man has spent fourteen years of his life in Newfoundland. He is a professional man and one who devotes all his time to the job. He is just the same as the Minister of Justice, any more than the Minister of Justice will probably be there for a year or two. The Minister devotes nearly all his time to his Department for $4,000 and makes but little outside. But this man Hall is an educated man and trained for his position, yet he is getting this year the same as last, though almost everybody else has got an increase. Why is it that you have not given an increase to the Government Engineer?

You have increased the chief clerk $700 but have left the head of the Department down for the same pay as he was receiving last year. I suppose the High Cost of Living does not touch him. I do not put the blame upon the Gvernment. Now we come to the Pension List. In these Estimates we have nothing to show that any vote was asked for them in the Estimates for 1920. I suppose some of these should be working and have therefore no right on the list. Last year the Pension vote was $25,190, this year you are asking us to vote $40,024, an increase of fourteen thousand dollars, more than the widows and orphans of this country are receiving. This is disgraceful. I do not know the intention of the Government but I am inclined to think they are trying to run her ashore. I wish to know what is to become of these amounts? I do not know and I do not care if the last Government pensioned them and if they did they are just as much to blame as you are. The first on the list is Chas. Way in the District of Fortune. The last time I saw him he was like a Gordon Highlander, he was fit for anything. I would like to know why he was pensioned. The

next we come to is A. J. Pearce, Sub-Collector at Twillingate. These Estimates have been handed down in a disgraceful condition. I consider that they should be brought down in a manner that any one new to this House should be able to follow them and discuss them in a sensible manner, and not be interrupted repeatedly by the members on the other side of the House. I am tired of that. Now I come to John Trapnell of Harbor Graie. He is down for a pension of $902. I would like to know the reason of that?

MR. ARCHIBALD.—I may say that when Mr. Piccctt was a member of the late Government he was instrumental in removing Mr. Trapnell and putting a Church of England man in his place to capture the Church of England vote. The job was held by the Methodists for seventy-five years and it was taken from them by Mr. Sullivan's men to catih votes.

MR. HIGGINS.—I suppose in the absence of the other ministers you are the Minister of Religious affairs.

MR. ARCHIBALD:—Mr. Sullivan was criticising the Estimates and I only told him why it was done. I can bring correspondence here to bear out what I say.

MR. SULLIVAN.—If that is the case I denounce them as well as you. I but accept your word.

MR. HIGGINS.—If you move up to the Minister's Chair then we cannot accept your word.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—You cannot pull anything like that over Harbor Grace District.

MR. HIGGINS.—The trouble about you is that you have too much two in one in the back of your head and you cannot get it out. You have a long way to go. If you want to get us into a discussion like this you may be surprised at what will come out of it. You better eat some ice cream so as to cool off.

MR. SULLIVAN.—I am only taking them as they come along and have no reason to pick out Harbor Grace. Here we come across the name of Mr. Cornick. He is pensioned off at the amount of $1200. I am sorry the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not here. The last time I saw him he was a fit man. Now here is the name of Captain Edward English. When he was pensioned he was a smart, healthy robust man. I do not know whether he wanted to be pensioned. I think he should not have been pensioned unless he wanted to be. The people should not be burdened with any extra pensions. Here is the name of John Kemp of Pushthrough. Why was he pensionel?

THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—He is in an advanced state of senility and is therefore prevented from doing work. He is seventy-five years old.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Now what about Wm. Thorburn of the Court House. He was messenger there. Why is he pensioned? All these are strange to me and I wish to get the information. May I ask the member for Burin why Joseph Mitchell is pensioned? The reason why I ask is because he may be a supporter of his. Here is the name of Mr. MacLoughlan; he is pensioned for fifteen hundred dollars and the man taking his place is receiving a substantial increase. He ought not to be pensioned unless he asked to be so.

THE HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE:—He asked me to use my influence to get him pensioned.

MR. SULLIVAN:—I take the honourable gentleman's word for it although I heard something to the contrary. Here is the name of E. Brocklehurst, messenger at the Colonial Secretary's Department. He is pensioned at the sum of $503. He was a smart man and healthy. What is the

explanation of that? Here is the name of Wm. Prideaux. This man is pensioned at the rate of $1100, and the man taking his place is receiving an increased salary. Now we come to the name of Wm. O'Brien, Health Officer. He is pensioned off at $1000 per year. Why is it he is pensioned? He is a healthy man and I understood he was quite able to do his work. Did he ask to be pensioned or was he unable to do the work?

THE HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—He is unable to do his work.

MR. SULLIVAN:—All right. I understand him to be a healthy man. Now, Sir, earlier in my remarks in criticising the Estimates I stated I thought that the Minister of Finance had allowed too little margin for the contingencies, and I am of the same opinion still. I will give my reasons presently. Last year we had the largest revenue on record, it was nine million dollars. Now I would like to ask the Government if they are justified in assuming that a similar revenue will be forthcoming in the years to come? I do not think they are justified under the existing conditions The revenue will depend entirely on the purchasing power of the people. Will the people have the same big purchasing capacities and will they purchase goods and provisions outside those which are absolutely required to warrant you in assuming that the country is likely to have a similar revenue as the one collected last year. We should bear in mind that the conditions last year were very extraordinary and we got immense prices for our staple industry. Then codfish fetched fifteen dollars per quintal, but we do not know anything about this year's catch. Last year cod oil rose to an equally good price and went over three hundred dollars per tun, and naturally the people then prosecuting the fishery were earning big money and consequently had a big purchasing power. Now we will take the catch of last year as being 1,800,000 quintals. Figure that out at fifteen dollars per quintal and we have twenty-seven million dollars, purchasing money handed over to the people of this country. On the other hand assuming that this year the catch will amount to the same thing but nevertheless it will hardly be as hundreds of the young men of the country have left in search of work. Supposing we get ten dollars for it. Now this year we will get eighteen million dollars against twenty-seven for last year resulting in a loss of nine million to the people and a possible loss to the revenue of about one million two hundred thousand dollars. Those Estimates brought down this year vote the sum of eight millions eight hundred and fifty six thousand six hundred and sixteen dollars. If this loss will ensue we are going to have a big deficit. I say that possibly we will not have the revenue of last year and that the revenue for 1920-21 will be something like six million. What will happen if that comes? I ask the Minister of Finance if he will be able to enlighten us if this happens and what he will be able to do to carry on this country.

If there is a loss in the purchasing power of the people, and I think that is as certain as the sun rises in the east and sets in the west. To get out of this difficulty there are several ways. In the first place more taxation would be required to increase the revenue if that were possible but I am of the opinion that the public today are staggering under the burdens they are already carrying. Why not impose a tax on the well-to-do and lighten up a bit on the poorer class. I can give one instance in the

matter of coal. The poor man who can get only a quarter of a ton at a time has to pay just as much as the man who can put in 20 tons soft coal at one time. Why not put a tax on hard coal. That is only one instance. Another thing we should do is to protect our institutions from unfair competition. We have very great competition in the foreign markets, and it is up to us to protect our interests there. Put us on equal terms and the new rules regarding the regulations will put us in a position to put an article on the market that will compare favorably with the products of other countries. The South American market we have not yet touched. I mean the southern part of the South American market, and I hope the Government will lose no time in introducing our fish products to that big market. I do not intend taking up much time on the Estimates. As they come up for discussion I may have a word or two more to say on them.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Chairman, there are just a few words that I would like to say, and perhaps before we enter upon them it might be well to clear the atmosphere regarding the attitude toward the Estimates. I fear the Government members have a wrong idea of the duties of both sides of the House in considering the Estimates, and if a picture of the present sitting were taken, showing all the responsible Ministers absent, it would do no credit to the House in later years. The Estimates form the most serious business to be dealt with. A week ago today they were laid upon the table and with an air that something holy was brought up and should not be questioned by the Opposition. We dare not criticize them. The whole proposal was fired at us badly gotten together, badly printed, unbound, ill arranged, and unexplained, and we are asked to accept them because they were tabled by Mr. Brownrigg. I wish to deal with the principles involved, not with the individuals touched on. The Minister of Finance has to assume responsibility for the estimates, and it is an unwritten law that they are never considered until all the Ministers are present to explain, as is their duty, matters relating to their departments and things the Finance Minister does not know. Our decision not to pass them while no explanations were given was the same as would be made by the other side if in opposition. It would violate the principle of the ages to accept any one vote asked for, and it would be disgraceful to think of passing two million dollars extra taxation with only a bare quorum present. No member beyond the Executive has any knowledge of the votes, and still we are asked to accept them holus bolus. To accept explanations chipped in by private members and pass the estimates would show neglect of duty to the public. It is the most serious day of a session when the estimates are entered on, as it is the first movement that touches every individual throughout the country. On what is passed the budget will be framed, and according to what is decided now will the people be taxed. At first blush the Estimates may not be deemed so important by new members. Criticism is put down for mere opposition; but criticism is the duty of the Oposition. Sometimes it is the most ignorant remark that speaks the truth, and this is one of the times. Government members being under party rule can't be expected to stand against the votes, but it is up to those on the Opposition side to enquire into financial measures affect-

ing the whole country. It is a sacred duty of the Opposition to the people, and if they neglect it they would certainly be false to their trust and be looked on as purchased slaves, and blamed for taking $1,000 for themselves, where previously we got only $250.00.

What the bringing in of these Estimates amounts to is that the Government comes in here like the directors of a company bringing before the shareholders their plans of management for the coming year and it is but right and reasonable to think that these proposals should have first been given careful consideration before being submitted, and I am safe in saying that not alone have these Estimates not been carefully prepared, and not what they ought to be, but in the very manner of introducing them the Government has laid down principles which are vicious, principles which should not be endorsed, principles which the more we think of them, the more they seem calculated to make people think that, well, if one crowd was bad the other is worse, and to confirm the thought that all is not gold that glitters and that things are not always what they seem. It is a pity that the Ministers of the different departments are not here this evening as there are certain personal references I wish to make, and which I think should be made in the hearing of these hon. gentlemen, but as these are not likely to be here till the Bay de Verde Election is over and Mr. Puddester returned, I shall defer them till then and therefore, I will only hit the high spots, as it were, and merely endeavor to make hon. members on the other side understand why, when we were so quiet before, we now become "violently antagonistic." All down through the year previous to the election certain people said it was time for a change and perhaps they were right. Personaly I believe that a change does some good on times; we were told to turn the grafters out, to arrest the boodlers and put them behind the bars and not alone were the grafters to be put in jail, but the procession was going to be headed by the Prime Minister himself and naturally the people thought that something good was to come out of the change and my hon. friend from Trinity, Mr. Guppy, and others like him realy believed that this was so. What a humiliating position for these men to find themselves in. They went out and told the people of their districts that the day of the grafters was done, that the day of the men who did nothing while they were in power but plunder was over, and that in their leader had been found the saviour of the country, and so these rank boodlers and that king pirate Woodford were turned out and good Mr. Jennings takes over that department and started cheese-paring and running things so finely that improvements are apparent every day. The Hon. Minister is so careful that I am told the splits are no longer bought by the bundle but he has had regulation size boxes prepared for all the departments into which the splits are measured and the day of the Broad Cove man is finished. Instead of the splits costing three cents a bundle as formerly they now come to two and seven-eighth cents and even that saving is an example to the other departments the great things that can be done in the way of economy. But, sad to relate, as the hon. member for Placentia, Mr. Sullivan, has put it, we fed our own child first, and despite the promised reform the Government soon fell into the ways of the notorious gang that preceded them. There are two things about the Department

of Public Works that are not like when Mr. Woodford was there, there are no scrips and the Bell Island man must go somewhere else to get his dollar. Why, sir, after all this talk about turning the grafters out and putting the boodlers in jail, to lay before us Estimates like this is, as a former leader in this House and who has since attained to higher honors elsewhere, said on a memorable occasion, enough to make a cat laugh. As the late Mr. James Murray once said, nobody knows where we are going or wither tending. Here we are with these Estimates before us and we are asked to pass them, yet there is not a man here who can answer the simplest question with regard to any of the votes, and not alone that but the very manner of tabling the Estimates was unusual. I have been in this House now for twenty years as a reporter and a member and I never saw nor do I think any hon. member here ever saw them brought down like this. There was always a digest made from the Estimates and time was given hon. members to consider it before being asked to pass the different votes and why this was not done now it is difficult to say. I do not say this is the fault of the Hon. Minister of Finance but I do say that there is no one in the Government who cares two straws whether the House likes the form of tabling the Estimates or not. We have been told from the other side that the odds are two to one against us but I will say here that not a single vote will go through until the information asked for has been furnished us and as the Hon. Minister admits his inability to give us this information, I think it would be a graceful act to adjourn the House until Mr. Puddester is elected.

Poor Mr. Barnes over there to-day is alone. He has no Bill, no Department. We can't consider his Bill and he don't know where he is at and he don't know where he is going. There may be no department. There is no head and no deputy and he may be wandering around for the next four years educating the government and I think that in this position he will be able to give full value. There was a big rush when this matter was first brought up. Our education was going to be greatly improved, but yet it daren't be touched, it daren't be considered, and it will not be considered as our Hon. friend the Minister of Education has told us.

HON. MIN. OF EDUCATION.—That is not true. I said I considered it would be unfair to consider a principle before it was put in the Estimates. It has been put in the Estimates but the Bill will be brought down before you are asked to vote on them and if this House doesn't appeal to such a policy let the Estimates be amended.

MR. HIGGINS.—It so happens that when you approach this subject some of us know what we are talking about. I know this that you are not yet in a position to introduce an Educational Bill into this House. It's true, and you know it is true. You can't bring down estimates here and vote salaries for a Department that may not be created and if it is created it will only be created on ight lines.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE.—Hear, hear.

MR. HIGGINS.—Hear, hear is right. A department will be created when and only when a satisfactory Bill is brought down. At the present time the work that is to be done by the department of Education is being done by Mr. Butt of the Colonial Secretary's Department. Mr. Butt is everybody and the laughable situation about it is that if anything happens to him nothing at all can replace him. In reference to the Estimates, they appear

to have been slung together in a hurry and pretty badly. You almost want an index to try and find out where things are. The Hon. Minister of Education says he cannot ask us to consider a Bill. You can't make yourself the whole department and vote the whole to yourself. So far as we are concerned in the Opposition it is not a question of being asked to consider but we hazard the opinion and are doubtful that we are going to be asked. Time will tell us if that list of votes is going to be altered. It is the duty of the Opposition to criticize, and primarily and above all the first and most important thing we have to consider in the bringing down of estimates is the condition of the people which you are governing. Remember, Mr. Chairman, there is not a member of the Government who will be elected by these Estimates. Our portion is small, there is no trouble for us to stick out our stomachs and look fat.

Last year in the Estimates the country was asked to vote seven million dollars, and this year they are asked to vote nine million dollars. The Estimates must go up in reason if officials are to get increases that are due and if you are to carry on the work of the country, but then, it is to be remembered that this year the outlook is not of such a nature to warrant any unnecessay expenditure, and it is our duty to see that unnecessary things are deferred. I do not say for a moment that the officials of the Civil Service are not worth the increases they are getting, but to increase the Estimates two million dollars at one blow is disgraceful when we remember that a few years ago two million dollars was considered a large sum for the whole thing.

In making up Estimates for this country it should be considered that we are not in a different position from any other country. We cannot count upon any great change in the number of our population, and the natural result is that the same people who were paying the Estimates last year will have to pay them this year, and it will be a great addition to the burden already too heavy that they have upon their shoulders. If we were compiling Estimates for a big country like Canada where the population is continually gowing it would be a different matter, large sums could be voted on chance, but what is the position here. We are like a family. It should follow from this that like the father of the family who feels the expenses grow heavier as he has to rear this family, that he gets a certain amount of consolation from the fact that the sons will soon be grown up and able to take a share of the burden which he bears. But the position we are in is this: We have the same old father under the same old difficulties, with the difference that he has no help to look forward to, and in view of this it is criminal of us to come in here and vote an increase of two million dollars in the Estimates over last year, when we consider that a few years ago two million in itself was considered a tremendous amount to be voted for Estimates. There has to be an increase, but we should see to it that all unnecessary expenditure is avoided.

Now take the history of the present Estimates. Take the attitude adoped by the Government, and particularly by the Prime Minister, who recently got up and endeavored to suggest that the report ought not be made public and who at first did not seem inclined to give it at all. Of course this attitude was so ridiculous that he withdrew from it, but not until he was compelled to. This report is not only due the public, but it is of particular interest to them at the moment, in view of the Estimates this year. With

regard to this report I will not trans gress, and reveal anything of such a character that might reflect upon any branch of the Civil Service, but I must say that reading this report and taking the suggestion given that not alone is that not so, but the remarkable thing about the Estimates is that, where certain individuals desired it that report was used to their benefit, but where it did not suit them it was ignored. I will draw attention to this aspect of the case more fully when we come to the differ ent departments, if we ever come to them. There is one thing in this report that summarizes the whole situation and bears me out in what I say that the suggestions of the Commission were followed when suitable and passed when unsuitable. Take the case of the Leader of the Government. The Commissioners laid down that the heads of all Departments should receive four thousand dollars a year, but that if anyone should be head of more than one department that he should not receive more than six thousand dollars, but this was ignored and the Prime Minister puts himself down at four thousand as Prime Minister, four thousand dollars as Colonial Secretary, and one thousand dollars as a member of this House, apart from his connection with the Government Savings Bank, the Board of Works, and the Militia Department. I would be willing to bet that his salary is nearly fourteen thousand dollars. In view of this, how can anyone be asked to believe that the Estimates are based upon the Commissioners' report. It shows that the Government are looking after themselves first. If there is going to be a wreck, the crowd now aboard of her are seeing to it that they will be safe.

The Government says, if she is going ashore, while she is afloat we will see that we are looked after, and let the others down in the hold take their chances. If this report ever sees the light of day thre are a lot of things that will have to be explained. The Commissioner's' report also classified the following three gentlemen as equivalent to Heads of Departments: the Assessor of Taxes, the Auditor General, and the Liquor Controller. Now it is funny that although the Commissioners recommended this that the Assessor of Taxes was passed over. I want to ask the Minister of Finance and Customs what explanation in fairness can be given of this.

HON. THE MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS:—There is no reason why the suggestion was not followed.

MR. HIGGINS:—I recognize the fact that as the Minister of Finance and Customs has said there is no explanation of this. It is another glaring example of the callousness of the Government to turn down the best officials in the Customs department. Of course the trouble is that he is not useful. Other men might be able to be used in politics. The work performed by Inspector O'Reilly and thrust upon him reflects the highest credit upon him and the late Government who appointed him. When he was appointed it was said that the collections would not pay for the machinery to collect same, but he was appointed and was practically alone in that work, and today we see the great result of his work, and after all that he is turned down, in spite of the recommendations of the Commissioners, while the Prime Minister gets much more than was recommended by them. It is not a question of saying that the Ministers should not be paid, and that salaries should not be increased, but this I do say, that we should not bring the Estimates before this House looking after ourselves, without first seeing that

the rank and file are properly treated. I think that is a principle that cannot be disputed. No matter how much we think of ourselves we have no right to come in here and look after ourselves while other deserving people are turned down. This is one of the things that will make the country lose faith in all of us, not only you on the other side of the House, but we on the Opposition as well. I see that Mr. Targett is laughing. You needn't laugh, Mr. Targett. This is no laughing matter for the people who will have to bear the taxes. You are alright, you will get your thousand dollars. You think it is a great joke to come in here and vote ourselves a thousand dollars.

MR. TARGETT:—That is not true. I was not laughing about that at all.

MR. HIGGINS:—Seeing that you are getting well paid, and when you got on that side of the House you took good care to see that they would.

MR. TARGETT:—I don't think it is fair for you to accuse me of that.

MR. HIGGINS:—Will you support me when I vote against them? I know you are independent. Will you get up and move that this be abolished or will you support a motion whoever makes it?

MR. TARGETT:—That is a thing I am not prepared to say until the time comes.

Take the position of the soldiers today with regard to pensions. There is a feeling amongst these men that something should be done for them in the way of pensions. Well surely if there is justice in that demand what right have we here today to vote ourselves an increase and not have their claims considered. Not alone is it not right to do it, it isabsolutely criminal to pass increased votes for other purposes without attending to their claims first. Take the Upper House. Does any honorable gentleman believe that the men in the Upper House want the increase that has been voted to them, or that it is a necessity. Run down the line of the gentlemen who are there. None of these gentlemen will want for food or fire. Their votes are doubled, while the doorkeeper remains stationary, the messengers remain stationary and the Usher of the Black Rod is decreased. I don't know what the Government thinks of Mr. Pinsent, but if his position in the past has been paid for at a certain rate, it ill becomes us to decrease it, and to vote double to the Hon. members in that House. and to make a special position there for a man who was not elected at all. In doing this we cheapen that House and we insult the Hon. gentlemen there. The idea is that our House should be increased, but it would be a greater compliment to them to treat them as they should be treated, as gentlemen, who go there at a sacrifice and serve their country in a spirit of public duty, as they really do. Does anybody think that two hundred and fifty dollars will pay those men for their time spent in that House? Does any man think that any Hon. member in that House would value his time spent there at two hundred and fifty dollars? Then why increase it, when the salaries of pages, doorkeepers and reporters remain the same. The principle is wrong and cannot be defended. As regards our own House is it right to come here and vote an increase in the Estimates in our sessional pay from two hundred dollars to one thousand dollars, and not to give one dollar increase to the clerks, reporters and pages? Does any member in his conscience as a man think that it is right to do this? Is there any defence for it?

MR. HIGGINS:—I didn't think that you would. I don't blame you,

sir, because everyone recognizes that you are only human. The point is that up to now we all thought that you were an angel. We thought that to ask you to take more money would be to insult you, and we were afraid that if such a thing were suggested that you would leave the House. I thought that if such a proposal was brought up that the least you would do would be to get up and denounce it, and that is why I was surprised at your laughing. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the hon. member is considering denouncing this bill, because he will realize the point I am making, that however much our opinions may differ as to the correctness of this bill, that nothing like this should be brought in until the other deserving people are attended to first. The principle I repeat is that it is not a question of making the allegation, that a man is not worth an increase or that any member who comes in here is going to make a fortune out of it, but that it is proper for us to vote those increases, under present conditions.

I understand also that there is some trouble with the official reporters in connection with the amounts that they are to be paid. I reported in the Legislature many years ago and was paid a better salary then than the reporters are paid now. And still we leave out those men when making increases as well as all the rest of the help around here and we sit down happy and contented because we ourselves are voted $1,000. We will have more to say about this matter later. When the vote comes up we will deal with it a little more friendly, perhaps. But before we go through any of those Estimates, in the light of the suggestion I have made, I would ask the Government if it would not be wise and proper, and would it not be better for us for the sake of public opinion and for the purpose of restoring public confidence in this House, if for no other reason, to treat these officials right and decent and pay them for their services. You know it's a poor skipper that will not look after his officers, and it is poor boss in charge of a job who does not look after his crowd. Such a man would not be playing the game right. The same principle applies to the Civil Service at large. Take the leading official in this House. The salary of the Clerk in this House was greater years ago than it is now, although the work he is called upon to perform is considerably greater today. The present session has been going on for over the past two months and will go on for some long time to come. Take the system and the quickness with which the reporters turn out their work today and the undoubted satisfaction given by them. Is it right and just and proper to pay these men for that work less than what was paid reporters many years ago, and particularly in the light of the fact that we increased our own vote five times over. Now here is a suggestion. Let us take that big increase that we provided for ourselves and divide it amongst the reporters, as an increase for them, and let us wait until next year for the increase.

Take the Ministers of the different departments of the Government today and the absolute indifference displayed by them in this House. Only four Ministers are in the House at present the others are busily active in another direction. There is no one in the position to give us any explanation about the Estmates. The idea, I think is anything but a good one. We should look after others with our-

selves. It is not playing the game with the civil servants or the officials right in this House. Now I want to repeat to the Mnister of Finance, to bring it to the attention of the Prime Minister, under whom this legislation was done, that it will happen if you create the idea here among clerical help and among minor officials that they are not fairly treated and that they are not going to be paid decently, and the idea must be created according to the present Estimates, then we can only get poor help and we cannot expect to get competent help. Let me illustrate the position clearly. My conception of a reportorial staff is this: I would pay a good reporter a sufficient salary to warrant his making an effort to come here. I would enduce a staff to become a permanent staff. The trouble with reportorial work is that the amount allocated to competent stenographers, who are engaged in other directions, is not sufficiently attractive to them to put themselves out to try to be here, if they can fit in at work outside. There is nothing to induce a man to be here each session. And my notion is the notion that prevails elsewhere as regards the official reporters. You got to make reporters pay sufficiently attractive to warrant a man remaining on the staff instead of having to come in year after year and session after session to break in a new staff. If you do as I suggest we will all get better results in the handling of our work, and you will encourage a good man to stay on. As regards the present staff, I do not for very many years, and I do not know when I saw better satisfaction given. The work here is promptly done and well reported, and, I would ask, as regards the matter of remuneration for reporters, that this be taken into consideration and the Estimates made so that justice will be done them. The same principle may be applied to Mr. Mott, Clerk of the House, who has been here almost since Responsible Government and who probably will be here when we go into Confederation. I know that when a matter of this kind is under discussion that Honorable members of the Government are going to say well here are the Estimates and we are not going to change them. I recognize the unwisdom of changing Estimates, but I must readily say that upon a matter that we feel that injustice has been done, surely the Government are going to be big enough to depart from what was the practice in the past. We cannot alter or make votes from this side of the House; but we can recommend and suggest. Our only power is that of suggestion. And may I now suggest to the Government that if we honestly feel that a sessional indemnity should be fair and equitable that we do one thing or the other. Better give no sessional indemnity at all, rather than offer a man $200 for coming here. Either compensate a man properly or none at all; and let the same principle apply to Ministers of the Government. If we do that it will tend to greater efficiency. We must not make the change for any one individual or the other in this House, but readjust the salaries of those all down the line.

I will just refer to a few of the things as they strike one on looking through the Estimates. What I say at the present stage are more or less preliminary remarks, as it would be impossible to make a close commentary on the Estimates because they are in such form. I speak of the Estimates as having been unfortunately hurried. Probably those in charge of them were handicapped and experienced great difficulty in getting the figures and other stuff from the diff-

erent departments. There is nothing in the Estimates to indicate exactly what is the present salary of officials and we are not in a position today to consider them or discuss them intelligently when the Ministers responsible for those Estimates and who should be here are not here. In other words, let us take the first vote that strikes one. The Orderlies at Government House are down for 1919-20 as $1235 against $1618. There is nothing to indicate that they are receiving $1618 at present or not, or nothing to indicate whether or not that amount includes the 20% that was paid them recently. The same will be seen all down through the Estimates. You are going to find yourselves in this position that the Opposition is going to be in the happy position of continually asking what is the salary of a man to-day. To attempt to discuss these Estimates even on the broadest lines those Ministers, who are in charge of the different departments, should be here. Take for example the Marine and Fisheries Department, which we will be able to dispose of later when the Minister is here. The one thing that strikes me right off hand in that vote is the extraordinary habit acquired by this and all the other departments of having a private secretary. It has become a sort of mania, or what is more commonly termed: that style is killing the crowd. Every head of a department must have a secretary. That seems to be the one great essential. If one only goes on a train or a motor trip he must carry a secretary. We hope, by and by, when the Minister returns to this House to ask him to explain his latest and most extraordinary attitude in this connection. Now, I happen to know, as a stenographer, the qualities of the typewriters down these for $720 each. There is a new position created in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, that of Secretary at a salary of $1200. Can anyone tell me if $720 represents the salary of Miss Calpin? No one answers, and no one cares. I say this is an unfortunate position to be in.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—Yes; that is Miss Calpin's salary.

MR. HIGGINS:—I say that this is an unfair thing to do; it is an absolute downright disgrace and a manifest injustice. And the best proof that my position is taken off hand is that I do not know who the new secretary, who is put in there at $1200, is. I understand he is a young man named Clouter. I do not want to refer to him personally. He is put in there because he is a personal friend of the Minister at $1200 a year, and that girl, than whom there is no more competent stenographer in St. John's, highly educated, an acomplished girl in every way and judging by her work she is decidedly a level-headed girl and has been in that department for years. If I remember rightly that girl's salary was something like $1100. She is a good and competent stenographer, worth any money to any department and worth very much more money than is paid to lots of people in that department, and still her salary is cut from $1100 to $720. If I were not in this House I would make use of an expression that I would very much like to term this scandal. Anyway, to say the least of it, it is a low down rotten thing to do and it is a reflection on the principle of the public service. I repeat: that to turn around and reduce her salary and bring in an entirely new man at an increased salary, in the light of what I have already said, it is not right, it is not proper, it is not decent, and it is the kind of thing that kills

the public and also shows the insincerity of the Party of Reform.

They are to blame when this kind of thing happened, and this I do say that from a party that went out with the idea of cleaning up abuses, with the idea of reforming things this reformation has been wicked and it shows the poor principles of the party if one of the ways of reforming is to cut down a girl's salary from $1100 to $750, and increase the salaries of that crowd who has the pull and who does not need it, to increase the higher official"s salary and cut the smaller official's is an unsound principle and the kind of thing that destroys the public service, the hope of the public service, it's only chance is to get the officials to work faithfully and work well in every department of the public service and get it out of the rut in which it has been for so long, but the very life of that hope is here struck at. I recognize that the traditions handed down is that the man who has worked and bawled for the party will be given the most and that the competent and the faithful workers will not be taken account of, and I say that in reference to the party coming in here upon the idea of public service reform, upon the idea of cleaning up these things, these grossly neglected state of affairs, but in view of cleaning up those things and changing the principle they have carried it to an extent that is worse than ever prevailed before. Now take the department of the Prime Minister. The secretary is to receive two thousand dollars. Undoubtedly he is a good secretary and that particular gentleman is well worth it. There is adso an assistant secretary in the Department of the Prime Minister and not alone is a position for an assistant secretary created but also the position for a telephone operator in the Colonial Secretary's Department has also been added. Now this one official is head of two departments and it is an extraordinary and somewhat unexplainable thing to me that the assistant secretary in the department of the Prime Minister should also be a secretary in the Department of the Colonial Secretary. The work of the honourable leader of the Government, in the sense of an executive head, is really done in the Department of the Colonial Secretary and through that channel most of the official business goes and it seems an extraordinary thing to me to create a new secretary in the department which has heretofore been looked upon as a department in name. Now the deputy head of the Colonial Secretary's Department gets thirty-six hundred dollars per year and he is one of those referred to as having got a recommendation for an increase. Could someone tell me what the Chief Clerk and assistant deputy, previous to this, was getting? He is down in the Estimates for twenty-four hundred dollars. Mr. Jennings does not know. Mr. Guppy does not know, and we do not know. Nobody knows. This is an extraordinary thing. Here we are; nobody knows and nobody cares what Mr. Stirling was getting previous to his getting twenty-four hundred dollars in these Estimates.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—He was getting seventeen hundred dollars, and to that you have to add the twenty per cent. increase.

MR. HIGGINS:—I would like to know if he was only getting seventeen hundred. I see twenty per cent. has to be added. Well, that can be added. That elucidates the point. I see twenty per cent. has to be added to it and twenty per cent. to that of the Second Clerk. Well, now, you might eplain to me why it is in pro-

portion the Deputy's is raised from twenty-four hundred to three thousand six hundred, the First Clerk from seventeen hundred to twenty-four hun dred, and the other man's salary from thirteen hundred to sixteen hundred? Now take the Second Clerk, he was getting twelve hundred and sixty and to that must be added twenty per cent. Well he is down here as getting sixteen hundred but the third clerk was down in the Estimates for 1920 as receiving twelve hundred and sixty and add twenty per cent. and he is down here for twelve hundred dollars.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—That is Mr. Butt and he is to be transferred to the Department of Education.

MR. HIGGINS:—Well, I must say that I admire Mr. Butt. He will be safe anyway as under the vote for the Colonial Secretary's Department he will receive his salary and not from the vote for the Education Department which may not be required. We are supposed to be educated in this country and this official Mr. Butt draws attention to the awkward position you are in. Can anyone tell me why an attendant is required to the Department of Colonial Secretary? Is this a valet? Is it a he or a she? It is not a she. The reason why I ask is that I have heard a lot of fancy ladies visiting here and I was wondering if this was one of them.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—That attendant is Mr. Brocklehurst.

MR. HIGGINS:—I am glad that the attendant is Mr. Brocklehurst. He is a supporter of mine. And I must say that he is a good man.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—He was taken from the Board of Public Works and voted the amount for extra hours.

MR. HIGGINS:—Take next the position of the telephone operator. This person is to get six hundred. Why this operator? Surely the Department of Colonial Secretary is not called during the day with such a terrific rush that a person is required for nothing else but to answer calls on the telephone. Surely the honourable minister does not ask us to believe that the telephone calls in the Colonial Secretary's Department, with all respect for the Colonial Secretary who is so energetic, are so great in number that a person is solely required for that position.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—There is a direct line with the head of each department.

MR. HIGGINS:—When was that installed?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—About last November.

MR. HIGGINS:—In other words there is a private wire between the Ministers of each department. Surely you are so suspicious as we believed. You are certainly taking precaution against leakage when you even so protect the business done on the wire.

HON. THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—You may except the Department of Public Works. No connection was made with that department.

MR. HIGGINS:—I have confidence that you will not give anything away. Nothing ever occurred which so aptly illustrates what I have always thought of you. You are such an honest man that if you heard what happened over that wire you would not be where you are to-day. I may tell you that you are too temperate, and I am sure you would not do anything with a private wire to the Controllers Department. However, this much is to be said. This has come out accidentally. This economical Govern-

ment, this great crowd to save the country's money is very anxious about saving it when owing to a mistrust in everybody else they install these private telephones and even to save expenses they exclude Mr. Jennings from this communication, but as far as St. John's East is concerned I would like to be always in touch with the Department of Public Works.

MR. HIGGINS.—Is the Minister of Agriculture & Mines also on this private line? He is on it. He must be on one end if the Prime Minister is on the other. I am glad this information came out accidentally. If you could see the face of Mr. Jennings, Mr. Foote and Dr. Barnes you would know that something has been going on that they did not know anything about and they weren't a bit too well pleased about it. This wonderful government must be arranging such great plans to save the country that they must be kept secret. This line was constructed shortly after the election, and I venture to assert that it was the creation of some diseased brain that was imagining plots by the Opposition to destroy him. This is not the time for private lines when great public matters should be attend ed to. The Prime Minister referred in his manifesto to a long distance telephone connection, and I suppose his is it. This is the Government reform that we are to look for. Is the Government House on the line? The Government House is not on the line you say. I understand that there was not the best of feeling between the Government and the Government House at all times ad I suppose that is the reason. Has there been any late increase for the Registrar. He was down to $1600. Why is his made only $2200? You don't know. Why is Mr. Doyle getting no increase? We come to the Department of Justice, the gentleman knows about that. His Deputy Head is down for $3,600. Then he is down for a secretary $1200. Take the other positions. There is a new clerk getting $1020. He is down here as new. Is there a new clerk or is there not? How many clerks are there? Speaking on that department while we are here now, is the Minister of Justice in a position to say whether it is the intention of the Gov ernment to bring in any legislation regarding the prohibition petitions that have been brought in here? You are not in a position to say. The Minister will agree that my judgment is right when I say that nothing has happened affecting respect for law and order as much as the attitude toward prohibition has. I mean smuggling. The Prime Minister suggests that a commission will be appointed to report on this matter, which means year. In the light of popular opinion something more than appointing a commission should be done in view of the large number of petitions, some 15,000, asking for modification. Nothing could be more reasonable than the second request of the petition that a plebiscite be granted. Day after day I see the worst kind of offences because of the liquor laws, and to begin with we have smuggling. Down in the police station you can see stuff with a sediment in it an inch deep. This is being sold for as much as $25 per gallon, and other stuff is being prepared and sold that is ten times worse than moonshine. The stuff is vile and filthy. Down in the Magistrates' Court people are fined because they are drinking this vile stuff that has more than 2 per cent alcohol in it.

When people come to realize that some, because of their connections, shipping or otherwise, can obtain all the liquor they want, an unfortunate position arises when a woman is brought befor court and fined for sell ing hop-beer a little above the allow-

ed percntage. This is the kind of thing that causes unrest. It is looked upon as class legislation and in the light of all this, may I not ask the Hon. Minister of Justice to accede to the requests that have been put forward so strongly and if a bill is brought in and passed and put into effect by the Governor-in-Council it will be a good thing, because there is nothing so demeaning, nothing so be-ittling as to have a crowd of able-bodied and intelligent policemen engaged in the miserable occupation of going around badgering and pestering people to find out if they have drop of stuff stowed away somewhere. There was a case the other day where a man got a present of a bottle of liquor and having accepted it he went and lodged a complaint with the police, and this is the kind of thing we are going to have while the practice of giving half the fine to the informer exists. I do not blame anyone for this but it is the kind of thing that causes unrest and suspicion and I would ask that the matter be taken into account by the proper authorities.

Now with regard to the matter of Old Age Pensions, I would ask the Hon. Minister if it is the intention of the Government to increase the amount of these pensions?

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE.—No.

MR. HIGGINS.—No; of course we must look out for ourselves first and let old worn out fishermen starve on his miserable pittance of fifty dollars a year, an amount that was never considered sufficient for a man to exist on, unless it was in the days of Indian meal, but evidently this is an other example of the Government's liberal policy. Surely if we can double and quadruple our own salaries, we might double the dole that we are handing out to the man whose hands are cracked by the salt water, the man we are all depending on. These are the men that returned you to this House, and one of the promise to which you pledged yourselves was the extension of the old age pensions. If you cannot be liberal, and we all know that you cannot be liberal to these men, be at least fair. How can any of the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who represent g back o tirccccccll shrNg eimade up districts made up wholly of fishermen, go back to their constituents and tell them, when asked what they have done, that they have voted a thousand dollars for themselves but that they voted nothing for their Uncle Sam who is looking forward to at least some increase in his pension. It is not too late yet to do something in this matter, and when these ministers who are now absent from their places come back, ask them to reconsider this, get the Big Chief to treat the fishermen with the same liberality as he has treated us. He has been generous to the members of the House of Assembly and I, for my part, thank him for it.

Now take the Department of Agriculture. The First Clerk is down at eighteen hundred dollars. The Second Clerk and Accountant at fifteen hundred dollars. The Secretary of Agriculture has received a large increase. Does any man know who is the Secretary of the Agriculture Department?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Bailey is Secretary of that Department.

MR. HIGGINS:—Why is his salary increased from twelve hundred and sixty dollars to twenty-five hundred dollars? What explanation can be given of that?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS:—In the absence of Mr. Donnelly his duties in connection with that department have become

much heavier, and he is a man with a family of twelve children.

MR. HIGGINS:—If the only excuse that can be given for Mr. Bailey's increase is that he has a large family, what possible excuse or explanation is there for the manner in which we create a new department and undertake to pay five thousand dollars to the head of that department without knowing for certain if we are to have that department at all? Is the suitable man for that department going to be a man with a large family?

MR. HIGGINS:—Reference was made here the other day to the Government Analyst, Mr. Davies. Now as far as he is concerned I know him well. He is thoroughly competent, and an excellent chemist, no better could be found. I think from the remarks of certain gentlemen on that matter that they must have been suffering from diseased brains when they come out with the statement, that because the leader of the Opposition commented upon that increase that he did so because he did not want the people educated along a certain line.

The man who wrote that article is a lunatic, he is a maniac, and I hope that when a department is created for treating such people that his case will be attended to. It is not a question of whether Mr. Davies is worth thirty-eight hundred dollars, for I say now that he is worth it, and much more than that. He is thoroughly educated, and highly competent, but I do say this: How will you reconcile this increase when you pass over other deserving people, heads of departments and others. Take the Charities Department. Is not Mr. O'Dwyer worth every dollar as much as the best Deputy head of any department in the Civil Service? It cannot be said of course that he will smother you with smiles, but what can be said is that he is a thoroughly competent official. He is so strict in his duty that he is almost uncharitable. No man in charge of any department of the Civil Service is as hard to try to get a concession from as this man, when it is outside his duty. He has not much political or social influence. but he is a hard-working, honest, thoroughly competent man, and the only reason I can see that he is turned down is that he does not trouble himself in a political way about you or us. I don't know what his political opinions are, but I do say that that class of thing should not interfere with the Estimates. In his department there are three officials, the Deputy, Mr. Power, and Mr. Kenny. They have received no increase and there is no explanation, and I see no explanation that can be given. Well, now, if it be correct that no explanation can be given of this, and I am certain that there is no better conducted department in the Civil Service, than this one, it surely proves that the Estimates have not been based either on the report of the Commissioners, nor upon any consideration of the worth of the individual. There have been spasmodic cases where this has been done but they are very rare, and it is no answer to say: "Why did not your party think of this when you were in?" That is not good enough from a party from whom we expect a change. The more one thinks of those extraordinary increases in the Estimates, and the fact that the Ministers who should be here to explain them, are absent, the more one thinks that it is unfair for the Government to ask us to continue on with these Estimates.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Chairman, I see the force of the

arguments advanced by the hon. member for St. Johns East, Mr. Higgins, and in view of them I would ask the Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, to raise the Committee until Friday.

The Committee then rose, reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw your attention to a message which I received from Clarkes Beach, and which appeared in the 'Telegram' relative to the sailing of the Labrador mail steamer.

I wish to draw your attention to the fact that the season is getting late. It is now the 22nd of June. These people are not much interested in the Bay de Verde election, and it is not right to hold that steamer at Reid's, and hang them up. At first blush you would think it is an enormous amount to be spending on a steamer, one thousand dollars a day, but on reflection, I would point out that it is not so serious as keeping back hundreds of people from the Labrador on that steamer, when you consider that if the wind changed to the north-east, and with the ice conditions, they might not be able to get down for weeks. I would like to call the attention of the Hon. the Minister of Justice, who is in charge of the House, and ask him if it is fair to hold that boat at Reid's when she is all ready to go to the Labrador. That is not the action of a Progressive Government. What is troubling me is that the gentlemen on the other side of the House, who are practical fishermen and know what this delay might mean, are standing for this. I would ask Mr. Jennings and Mr. Windsor. Is this fair to your brother fishermen of Conception Bay, to hold that steamer, at a thousand dollars a day expense when she is ready to go? It is unfair, and not at all business-like, and the Government who are doing it will certainly get their deserts at the hands of the people. I would like to know from the Hon. the Minister of Justice if he will stand for it. The Prime Minister is out of town, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is out of town, the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs is out of town, and he is in charge, and I think he is honest enough to issue an order to have that boat sail.

HON. THE MIN. OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Speaker, in reply to the leader of the Opposition, I might say that I saw the article he refers to, and that that was the first knowledge I had of it, and on inquiry I found that the boat was not ready to sail as they were putting on berths.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN.—I know that the boat has been ready to sail, and that she has been held there, and I was told that the order was that she would sail on the 24th. I know that the steamer is held up and that she has been ready to sail for the past two days. If the Hon. Minister of Justice would go up there and inquire he would find that the statement I have here is correct. She has been held for political reasons.

HON. THE MIN. OF JUSTICE.—I was informed that she was not ready to sail, as they were putting berths into her. The hon. member for Hr. Grace, Mr. Archibald, can substantiate me in that statement.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—I was on board that shp in interests of my district and I would not stand for her being held up. That boat is not ready to sail. I made inquiries and I saw dozens of carpenters putting berths into that boat. I went over there to see if she could be hustled up. I tried to see the captain to know when she would be ready to sail, but he was not there.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN.—That boat was ready to sail and was supposed to sail on the 24th, but the intention was to hang her up until election in Bay-de-Verde was over.

MR. ARCHIBALD.—I don't know about that, but I do know that there is a lot of work going on on that ship, and if there were not, I would not stand for her being hung up. You cannot send that boat down to the Labrador without proper accomodations. You cannot put the men down in the hold like cattle. I just arrived here yesterday and the first thing I did was to go aboard and find out why she was hung up. I could not see the Captain, but I could see that there was a lot of work going on, and that that was the reason that she was hung up.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN.—Why did you try to see the captain? Why did you not go to the Colonial Secretary s Department or to the Marine & Fisheries Department and find out? That boat was ready to sail and you will find that she will not sail until the 25th.

HON. THE MIN. OF JUSTICE.—The boat will sail to-morrow at two o clock.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN.—Well, you will see that she will not leave Bay-de-Verde until the 25th.

MR. SAMSON.—I wish to back up the statement made by Mr. Archibald. I was on board that boat this mcrning and from the amount of work going on there I am sure that she is not ready to sail yet. We saw that message that Sir Michael referred to and we went aboard to see what was the reason of the delay, and we found that she was not lt to sail.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and 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.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act for giving effect to Treaties of Peace between His Majesty and certain other Powers."

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill entitled "An Act for the Holding of a Municipal Election in the City of St. John's."

Mr. Vinnicombe gave notice of Question.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

FRIDAY, June 25th, 1920

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

HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS—Mr. Speaker: I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Trayton, Brighton and several other small places in the district of Twillingate on the subject of Prohibition. The petitioners ask that there be no modification of the Act. I would ask that this be referred to the department to which it relates.

NOTICE OF QUESTION

Sir M. P. Cashin asked the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries if Lt.-Col. Bernard is appointed Trade Commissioner for Newfoundland outside the Colony, and if so, where and at what salary.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—Mr. Speaker: In reply I wish to say that Lt.-Col. Bernard

has not been appointed Trade Commissioner.

MR. HIGGINS:—Would you mind saying whether or not he has received any Government appointment?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—He is gone over on something in connection with the war.

Mr. Higgins asked the Hon. the Minister of Justice, in the absence from this House of all Ministers known to be in any way connected with the Militia Department, if the Vocational Committee have resigned; also to Table copies of any correspondence between the said Committee or any of its members and any department of the Government within the past three months.

Mr. Vinicombe asked the Minister of Justice in the absence of the Colonial Secretary if any annual returns have been made to the Government by the Bell Island Tramways Co., if so, to lay the copies of the same on the Table of the House.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—These will be answered to-morrow.

Mr. Walsh asked the Hon. Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House all correspondence between deputies of all departments of the Government (or any department which made recommendations), and the Commissioners appointed by the late Government to adjust the Salaries of Civil Servants, also all recommendations from deputies of the several departments in relation to increases or otherwise.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—In the absence of the Prime Minister, I ask that this matter stand deferred.

Mr. Walsh gave notice of question.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act for giving effect to the Treaties of Peace between His Majesty and certain other Powers," was introduced and 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 Bills sent up entitled respectively, "An Act to provide for Commemoration Day" and "An Act to amend Chapter 108 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (third series) entitled 'Of the Protection of Animals'" without amendment.

Pursuant to order and on motion of the Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

MR. HIGGINS:—Before the House adjourned on the last day during that sitting you will remember that a remarkable position was created when we said that no vote would be passed in this House owing to its peculiar constitution, and consequently the House was adjourned until to-day on the motion of the Minister of Justice who at that time was leader of the House, because as I have said, of the attitude taken by the Opposition towards the Estimates, and now that the travellers have returned, now that the mighty men have come back and the real legislators are present, and in particular this guiding spirit and soul of the House is in the sound of my voice, the time has now arrived when that attitude can be understood. I would like to say to this soul, addressing it in its human form, that it is unfortunate we had to justify the opposition given and we have confirmed that idea of some in legislative moments known

as obstruction, and in that aspect we cold-bloodedly told the House that no vote would be passed until the Estimates were in a position before us as they ought to be. They are some what in that position to-day. They are in that because we have here present that great power of all who is quite capable to stand the responsibility of all the Ministers but in his absence we felt that we could not decently undertake the consideration of the Estimates. The Minister of Finance, the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Public Works, and the Minister who is yet to get his power, the Minister of Education, did their best I can assure those who were absent, and say, that in the Government's position were justified in what they did, and I think they even recognized not alone the impossibility but the impropriety of asking us to submit to a consideration of the Estimates with the House constituted as it was. And that aspect then referred to is now sufficient and it indicates those lines along which we propose to go. We are now in a position to consider them. We have been talking on this side of the House that no vote would be passed purely and simply because of the position in which the Estimates were presented. And to say the least of it it would have been indecent to undertake the consideration of them. There was nobody present to give us the information we asked for. We submitted the views we held in regard of the present votes and our desire to have certain information, and no one could supply it, and because of the intimation which was intimated respectfully but firmly of the position we were going to take the Government, through the then leader, the Minister of Justice, did what was to their credit in realising that at least we were in a position to carry out that intimation. Now that has been done and now we are in a position to consider the Estimates. I will at this stage make the suggestion that so far as I am concerned I belong to a tribe, and I belong to a race that is not perturbed much over the happenings of life, but I think they will be satisfied with the attitude I have taken in their protection, but now that the Minister has come back we will be able to deal with them which we could not in his absence. There was serious comment as regards certain votes and in regard to the manner in which they were presented owing to the absence of the head of the Department and in the absence of those who might know about them, and we, on this side of the House, who were of right entitled to the information, were debarred from it owing to the absence of them. I would like at the very outset to make it clear that it is not my intention to prolong this particular part of the Estimates which is a real ly formal matter, that is, the voting of the public debt, but when we do come to the individual votes we shall have ample opportunity to illustrate the views within us, and we will endeavour as far as possible to try and get the Government to realise that what perhaps is popularly called Opposition talk is just one broad representation of our views, and we intend to carry that line of discussion out, in reference to the question commented upon by us all, namely, the question of ministerial increases and the increases of indemnity to the members of this House. We have taken that attitude and through it we want the Government to consider the amount voted these who sit here in the Assembly. The position taken by me is this: That a Minister

today who really devotes his time and gives attention to his office is worth the salary, and I will go further and say that if he properly gives his time and attention to that office he is worth more than the salary. If a member comes into this House with the idea or the notion of getting this sessional indemnity he is not likely to be the class of man to be elected to this House, and, therefore, the principle applies that the sessional indemnity at least is sufficient to indemnify him against any actual loss, but in the light of the conditions under which we live, and in the light of the disclosures in the Estimates, and in light of overlooking of the smaller paid officials, and in light of particularly the lack of increase for the Old Age Pensioners, about which there has been much comment, the Government has no right and it is not worthy of us to vote ourselves such large indemnities and likewise the ministerial increases, and I think it is our bounden duty to defer both of these increases until we first see to it that those very justifiable complaints are first attended to. Let this be an exception to the maxim that "Charity begins at home" and before looking after ourselves let us give our attention and material assistance to those about whom complaints are made. I think the position is based upon principle, and is one admitted on this side namely, that in light of the conditions under which we are living, and in light of the fact that we expect confidence in those for whom we are legislating, we must endeavour to show them that so far as we are concerned we are prepared to make our sacrifices as well as they, and, on that account, I think it is not fair or right or even worthy of us to balk the Old Age Pensioners increase and increase our own indemnity. This is particularly improper for us for in so doing we are affecting public opinion and affecting the respect for law and order, and affecting the ideals in legislation, if we come in here and increase our own indemnities and those of the gentlemen in the Upper House. Surely those in the Upper House have not looked for it nor do they want it. The gentlemen there are men of independence, and who do not need it. Surely you cannot seriously contend that the Honourable President of the Upper House, and the leader of the Government there, want to have their present sessional grant doubled, when we are living in times to-day when that class of vote, when that class of legislation provision is going to disturb the confidence of the people in this House, and I urge upon the Government to recognize the position with regard to that. I want the Government to take the position that no honorable gentlemen, who are connected with the Government, come to the House for the purpose of drawing the increases allocated to ourselves by ourselves, and if they do that principle is unsound and it cannot be disputed.

A couple of other matters arose out of the discussion. One matter was illuminating as a new discovery. Some of the honorable members heard of a new institution. This we shall deal with at the proper time. It is not with any spirit of gusto or pride over anything that has been done, but the stand we have taken that no Estimates should be passed until the Ministers were here to explain them is justified as our duty to the country. No better argument could be found to justify our attitude than the fact that it was approved by the government as shown by the Minister of Justice adjourning the House from Tuesday until Friday. I repeat the welcome to

the members that are absent, and I hope their presence will have the effect of adjusting some of the ridiculous things that are now in the Estimates.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE.—Mr. Chairman, it is not my intention to delay the House, but the member who just sat down referred to my adjourning the House as an argument in justification of the attitude of the Opposition toward the Estimates. I did not intend the adjournment to mean that. Our procedure is at variance with other houses of parliament. In England and Australia the House goes into Committee on Supply without any statement from the Minister of Finance. Our civil service list is comparatively small, and it is reasonable to expect that the Minister of Finance can answer any questions regarding the civil service. In Canada that could not possibly be so because of the large civil service. The result is that the Minister of Finance in other countries gives no statement, and the minister of each department answers any question regarding his department. The Minister of Finance has been in office only six months, and it would be most unreasonable to expect him to be familiar with every item in the Estimates. The Opposition will take up the Estimates and ask questions from page 44, 46, 34, 22, and 11 at random. That is not the practice in other countries. With regard to the Estimates themselves, some points have been raised by the Opposition which will require explan ation and defence, but I merely get up now to disassociate myself from the idea that the Minister is supposed to answer any and all questions regarding the Estimates.

MR. HIGGINS.—The Hon. Minister of Justice is not quite in line with what is done in other countries. The point that I made the other day I repeat, the Estimates are always criticized by the Opposition. We are really the auditors on behalf of the people. Any objection to the Estimates must necessarily emanate from this side of the House. Who can say whether the votes are right or wrong? It has been claimed that they are based on the recommendations of the Commission.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS.—Some votes are based on the report.

MR. HIGGINS.—That makes the position still worse, and I shall prove that the increases are not on the recommendation of the Commission. If you say some it means that this exhaustive report was only to be followed in coming years. If it is to be followed in one instance why not in all? The place for comment is on the opening vote, interest on the public debt. Once that is touched, as the public have to pay it we have the right of examinaion. As the Minister of Justice does not admit our stand I am disappointed. If we are takng a wrong stand why didn't the Government go on Tuesday? They had a majority to carry on. The argument is not worthy the Minister, and is not endorsed by custom in the House.

The fates decreed that I should stand cigars for the reporters. The position is not altered, that the Minister of Justice comes along now and says that a certain thing is not done because it is not done in Canada. That is not worthy of the Hon. Minister, and I must say that I had expected something different from him. There were men who occupied the seats opposite and who occupied the seats on this side who followed out the practice I have mentioned and the example of these men is good enough for me. I do not imagine that the whole world cenres around myself and I say that every precedent of this House has been disrgarded, and according to the Hon. Minister we must

do this or that because it is done in Canada. Perhaps it is that the ministers are practicising Canadian methods. I have heard of ministers having ambitions to duplicate in Canadian politics they positions they hold in this country. I hardly think that the present Minister of Finance will very soon introduce the Budget in Canada, but if he does there will be somebody there abler than I to criticize it. The manner in which these Estimates have been presented shows that the Hon. Minister was not in a position to give us the usual digest which helped so materially in dealing with them. On former occasions the Minister of Finance was helped by his fellow-ministers to make a presentation of the facts in submitting the Estimates, but I indicated, and was right in the contention, that in bringing down these, every one scrapped for himself. So far as the Minister of Finance is concerned he has candidly admitted that he was not acquainted with the general principles on which this was done, but with all due respect to the opinions of the Minister of Justice, I think the good old-fashioned way was the best. Of course if the idea is that all things must now be done here as they are done in Canada, very well. Some one told me that the soldiers in the neighboring Dominion were marching from Vancouver to Ottawa to demand their rights, and if the march starts here I trust we wlil sit here until our soldiers have an opportunity to pay us a call.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE.—I regret very much much, Mr. Chairman, that my few remarks about Canadian procedure should have called forth such a heated reply from my hon. friend, the member for St. John's East. I only got up because he gave the idea that by adjourning the House on Tuesday I had admitted the position taken by him to be a correct and proper one. Now that is not so. No one blames the hon. gentlemen opposite for their criticisms, but they subjected everyone on this side of the House to a severe cross-examination as to the name of this or that official, their present salaries, their previous salaries, and so on, and because they were not able to get answers to all their questions they took the view that every one of the Ministers should be in his place to supply the information, and I merely pointed out that the procedure in Canada was to discuss and explain each vote as it came up. When the hon. member stated on Tuesday that no vote would go thru, I thought it just as well to adjourn the House until today, but the suggestion was never made that the conduct of absent Ministers was improper.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—Mr. Chairman, I would be lacking in my duty if I were to allow these Estimates to go by without offering some criticism. Although a new member in this House I know something of its procedure and I've seen other hon. members offer very much more obstruction than has been attempted by the Opposition this session, and the very Minister of Justice, who sits on the other side now, was one of the best examples of that. I remember sitting here from Thursday night to Saturday listening to the hon. gentleman talking about a post office at St. Johnes Within and now he tells us about how the Estimates are tabled in other countries. I've seen Estimates brought in here and spoken on for as much as two hours by the Minister of Finance before the House started to consider them at all, but the present Minister comes in with a proposed increase in salaries amounting to $1,860,000 and asks us to accept these Estimates without a word of explanation as to

why they are to be voted or who is to get them. If I did not criticise them I would be failing in the duty I owe to those who have to pay these salaries. Of course I never expected that any questions asked from this side would be answered, when we consider that the Hon. Minister of Finance, when he made his maiden speech in this House, said that he would not be associated with us.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—With your leader I said.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—We are not a bad crowd of people, a good looking lot of men even tho' we are grafters. In looking over the Estimates I notice that in the Board of Works vote there are some nice increases made although others are reduced from $1,200 to $700, now, I wonder did the Commission recommend that.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—I'll explain that when we come to it.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—How much is John Davey getting? There's nothing in the Estimates about it. The Magistrate at Harbor Breton is getting his salary increased from $612 to $1200 a year; why has this been done?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—That was placed there by the late Government.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—Take the salary of the Inspector General; he is getting $3600, and Inspector Grimes, after 46 years in the service, is only getting $1500; don't you think that he is deserving of better consideration than this?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—That's what the late Government did.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—Never mind the late government. You are the Reform Government. The Inspector General is only a lawyer like yourself —what does he know about constabulary? Ten constables last year were receiving $8,312.50, and this year they are only receiving $7,600.00; now, I think, this might be put the other way.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—That will be explained when we come to it.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—Well, just take a note of it. I notice that in the Minister of Agriculture and Mines Department the Deputy Minister, Mr. Turner, has received an increase, and I think that's about the only right thing the Government has done. The two Clerks, Mr. McNeilly and Mr. Hart, have received a very small increase, and why such is the case I can't understand. I believe they are doing the work of the late Mr. Thorburn, who was employed there, and I think that they are at least entitled to an amount equal to half of his salary for each man. But I don't think there is any necessity of me talking any more about this until we come to it. There are three sections in the Government to-day: The Coaker and Warren section is very nice, but the Squires section is venomous. The Minister of Finance told us some time ago that we had his sympathy.

MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—I'll explain that.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—My advice to the Minister of Finance is not to take anything out of the Squires book. At the present time he reminds me of that advertisement the Edison Gramaphone Company "His Master's Voice." He is the dog and Mr. Squires is the master. And talking about obstruction I can remember when the present Minister of Justice held up this House for three or four days talking about bicyles for the postal officials and St. Jones Within.

My advice to the Minister is to be nice to us today or we will hang up this House until Christmas.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS:—Mr. Chairman, I regret that I didn't speak for a few hours when I was presenting the Estimates a few days ago, but 90 per cent. of the Estimates was not our work and it was impossible for me to tell what was in the heads of those men who made the changes at that time; $10,000 was voted for contingencies, and $154,000 was spent, and it was impossible for me to tell why this amount was voted and that amount spent. The late Government asked that a vote be passed for the expenditure of seven millions for the coming year and they spent $9,-000,000. Now it is impossible for me to explain why these changes were made by the Government last year. I think all the Hon. members can appreciate why I don't know what has been paid out when I don't know what the Chief Clerk in the Customs House was paid last year out of contingencies. The Assistant Clerk was paid out of contingencies, and I don't know what he was paid as it was all embodied in the general report. One official down there was paid $16.00 per month of an increase out of contingencies. How did I know what he was getting out of contingencies. Any changes I have made in the Estimates I am prepared to give full and complete information as we come to the different items. I hope the hon. members will understand this.

MR. BENNETT.—Mr. Speaker, when the Minister of Finance and Customs laid the Estimates upon the table of the House, ten days ago, I think it was, and in accordnace with the request of the leader of the Opposition, they were deferred until next following day. Since then I have been performing public duties in other directions that have prevented me from attending the House and I have had no opportunity of considering the Estimates and hearing the discussions that took place in this House. The mission on which I was engaged assisting in the count at Bay de Verde did not turn out successfully, and in saying I am sorry, I mean that I am sorry for the people of the country. Time will tell whether the district has decided wisely. We feel that the work which we put in on that district although having no immediate effect, will bear fruit in the near future in a manner which is not contemplated today.

When the Estimates were tabled I had the honor of asking for the report of the Civil Service Commission which was appointed by the late Government, to be tabled. The answer was that it was impossible to do so as the Civil Service Commission had not made any report, but they had made certain interim reports, and the Government did not see their way clear to table them, as there were certain matters contained in them, that were better kept from the public. Evidently since then, there has been a change of policy on the part of the Government, because I have here a very lengthy report that was tabled a day or two ago, but which I have not had the opportunity to glance over as yet When this Commission was appointed, it was appointed with one object, and that was the purpose of seeing the discrepancies that the late Government were convinced existed in the different departments of the Civil Service. It will be remembered that a couple of years ago there was a great deal of agitation in existence amongst the members of the Civil Service with regard to salaries. They were paid salaries to keep themselves and their families on, which in many cases were not sufficient to

procure the necessities of life. They insisted that something should be done promptly to meet that contingency, and over two years ago, when Lord Morris was Prime Minister, his Government decided to give a percentage increase, granted so that those who were receiving small salaries would receive proportionately more benefit than those who were receiving large salaries. This apparently satisfied them for a time, but as time went on conditions again required adjustment, and last year just before the strike in the Postal Telegraph Department, when the operators stopped work, and held the Government up for immediate settlement of their demands, and we were powerless to do anything but to accede to their demands which were not unreasonable, that those who were giving good service to the country get the increase they looked for, it was brought home to the Government that if that were the case with the Postal Telegraph Department, it was equally the case with all other departments, but the difficulty was that it would take months and months to get a true conception of the state of affairs, and the Government saw no other course open but to appoint a Commission composed of men whose reputation would be beyond question to go into the matter of the Civil Service with a view to increasing not the salary of His Excellency the Governor, or the Ministers of the Crown, or the higher officials, but to see how the minor officials were being paid for their services to the country. In this country there has been no assessment of a man's ability. He is paid according to his position, and not according to his ability, and when that Commission was appointed, it was to enquire into the qualifications, and the work done by each official in the Civil Service. The duties of certain positions have changed, and the amount of work involved is not in proportion to the salary voted, but we have that salary whether there is one hour's work or twenty-mour hours work a day. We have postal officials in the outports who have to work all day and a good part of the night who are getting a salary of two hundred dollars or less for such service, and the main object in appointing that Commission was to see that salaries should be paid according to merit, and not according to the position the individual hold. Now sir, I have no information, unless it is contained in the report of the Commission on these points, but, I do say, that the Government have taken good care that those who least want it, those whom the country should expect as good service from, as in the past, should not have been given the large increases that they have been given. It is quite true that the estimates before us cover the increases granted last year by the Government of the day, but the heads, deputies and clerks of the different departments have been granted enormous increases, irrespective of ability, or service rendered, or the importance of the office held. There are some departments of the Government that are very important, and busy, and require continual service, departments, the offices of which are never closed, except very late at night. There are officials who go in their office at 10 o'clock in the morning and remain there until 10 and 11 o'clock at night to keep ahead of the work they got to perform; and there are other departments in which the offices are opened at 10 o'clock in the morning and the key put in the door at 4 o'clock in the afternoon, and we find that men who work 10 and 12 hours a day paid the same wages as men who work, perhaps, half that time. If this Commission have not reported on this matter, well then they have ignominiously failed and have not carried out the wishes of the late Government in this

connection. Certain increases are perfectly justifiable because it is only proper and right that a man should be paid for his services. People in mercantile life to-day have to pay very much higher wages than ever before, but the man in commercial life will always engage the best man he can get and he pays him accordingly; and there are young men in this city today, who, perhaps, two or three years ago, earned $500 a year are now earning three and four thousand dollars a year because of their exceptional ability in the different walks of life in which they are engaged. The increases that are provided for in the tabulated totals in the beginning of the estimates show an enormous increase in our public expenditure, increases that might well make us consider where we are drifting and what is going to be the end, if we go on at the rate we are going at the present time. It is unfortunate for the Government and unfortunate for the whole country that the business affairs of the country at the present time are not in the rosy condition that some people would like us to believe and are not in a condition that inspires us with confidence for the future, and, with an increasing debt and an increasing expenditure and with decreasing prices for our products, there is but one result possible. I do not care what Government is in power nor do I care who is responsible, but when the balance overweighs one side of the book to the other, it is like any business concern. After all the running of the country is like the running of a business. A business has certain earning powers; an industry has certain earning powers and must produce sufficient to meet its obligations and must get sufficient prices for its products to meet its liabilities. The same applies to a Government. A Government must keep down its expenditure according to the productiveness of the people whose trustees they are. They must keep down the cost of running the country in line with the products of the country, because, after all, our revenue should be raised according to the products that we have, but when those products drop below a figure that is necessary to produce that revenue to meet our expenditure, then we are straight on the road to ruin and disaster. It is quite within the knowledge of this House and every member of it that the prospects for the return of the great staple industry of the country this year are anything but bright at present and that the prices for our products will be much below what they have been for the last eight or ten years, and when the earning power of the people is reduced to such an extent as anticipated this year, then the people can no longer pay the taxation imposed upon them and keep up the public service of the country and meet their own private obligations. The high price of living to-day is appalling the people and never in the history of this country were the people so much concerned over the seriousness of the situation of affairs as they are to-day: and they will be compelled to curtail in their own homes; they will be compelled to curtail their own living expenses and they will have to deprive themselves of everything but the ordinary necessaries of life; in a great many cases in this country, to tide over next winter that might be, perhaps, one of the hardest seasons that they ever had to contend with. The low prices of our products and the high prices of everything else is the cause of the situation in this country today. Every other foodstuff and every other commodity is high in price, gone away above and beyond what we have had here before and the prices of our own products have not been as low for many years.

Why is it that fish, which is such a good foodstuff, has had its value cut in two, and in many cases less than that, when other foodstuffs are beyond the ordinary prices that the ordinary man can absolutely ill afford to pay for them. I say it is unfortunate for the Government that circumstances places them in the position that they have to introduce Estimates that will bring such a large increase in our public expenditure at a time when the whole country is looking to them to live up to the promises that they made when they went before the electorate, namely, that they were going to bring about a reduction of taxation and reform and rectify the many wrongs that they accused the late administration of and that they were going to make good to the people all the discrepancies that took place during the past ten years: and although we on this side of the House were parties with some of those on the other side to those discrepancies, still we do not shirk our share of the responsibility. But the Government of the day should live up to what they have promised the country and that is reform, reduction of taxation and happier conditions for the people to live in than they have had heretofore.

I think I stated before on the floors of this Assembly during this session when the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs brought in a Bill here some two or three weeks ago in reference to certain alterations in connection with his department. One item of which was that a registration fee was to be charged on parcels, which would mean a revenue of some five or six thousand dollars a year. The Minister said, when I asked the question as to what use this money was going to be put, it was going to help pay the Minister's salary. Of course I took the reply in the spirit intended, because I congratulate him on his prospects in answering that this amount mentioned was merely going towards the payment of his salary. Now I have been accused by a section of the press of this country of having got very large sums for work that I performed in a certain department of the civil service. I was the Colonial Secretary of Newfoundland for over four years, two years of which I received two thousand dollars a year and for the balance of that term I was paid two thousand five hundred per year. Well, every member of this House knows that such a salary is inadequate practically to meet the outside demands that they are usually to be met by a man in that position, because a man has got to live up to that position; he has got to perform public duties; he has got to become the target for every demand that is possible from the public and he will have a very small amount left out of his salary of two thousand dollars a year after continuously putting his hand in his pocket to meet the demands that I refer to. Well, I performed the duties and I have not yet heard of anything happening in that department but that the duties were as well done as heretofore or since. After I left that department in 1918, I went to the Department of Militia. I made the voluntary offer to Sir Edward Morris to relinquish the duties of Colonial Secretary for the purpose of establishing and organizing the Militia Department, because I was more in touch with militia matters, as Colonial Secretary, than any other Minister of the Crown. The Department of the Colonial Secretary's was the War Office of the Government from the starting of the war until the time I left it. Everything came through the Colonial Sec-

retary's office and it was only reasonable to suppose that I would know more about military work than any other Minister of the Crown, and I consequently offered voluntary to assume the new duties of Minister of Militia, and undertook to form and establish the department and administer therein to the best of my ability. The salary for the head of that department was made $3,000. Sir Edward Morris suggested $4,000 for the Minister of Militia, because, as he pointed out, that there were certain officials in that department whose pay of rank would give them over $3,-000 a year, and he did not want a Minister at the head of that department with subordinates paid a bigger salary. I have been openly accused in the public press of having been paid a salary that I did not earn I want to say to the House this evening that during my tenure of office as Minister of Militia, during the most trying period of the war, that I went to that office every morning at 10 o'clock and I never left it until 6 and 7 o'clock in the evening, and every hour that I was in that department I was engaged. In fact, I absolutely neglected my own affairs, and left them to others to lock after, because the duties were incumbent upon me as head of that department that they required as much of my time and attention as possible. I may be accused by my opponents of certain transactions in connection with that department, but to which I am not going to refer this evening.

And I hope to have the opportunity before this House closes to refer to some things which were made use of to villify me personally and in my pub lic capacity and to give my side of the story so that a different impression will be left upon the minds of honorable members of Assembly and possibly those who have seen fit to villify me in connection with my work in which I should have had the sympathy and assistance of the whole community and of every man who called himself a British subject and not be subjected to the scorn and ridicule which was handed out for the purpose of political expediency and political revenge. The salaries of the Ministers would not be too high at four thousand dollars but it is unfortunate that those increases should be made at this particular time.. It has created a good deal of discontent. It has created a great lack of confidence in the Government because they think that the time is not opportune for them to put heir hands in the Public Treasury, for the country was never in a worse condition and and to their own salaries forty or fifty per cent more than they were before. As to the pay of the members of this House, well, under ordinary circumstances it would be excusable, but I say this that we should not consider ourselves or our own interests. The example of the members of the House would have a wonderful effect throughout the whole country. The Government has thought it wise to give these increases, and I can quite understand why hon. members who are sitting here week after week and month after month and who are not resident here in St. John's want to live and expect to live at home. These gentlemen are entitled to compensation for the time they are away from their houses attending to their public duties. But heretofore the representatives were content with the old salary and no doubt some felt it a great hardship that adequate provision had not been made to meet their personal obligations whilst rendering services here in the Legislature. It is only reasonable to expect that some consideration must be given to and some increases granted, but if the Government allow the contemplated large in

crease they will not make a good impression or set a good example to the smaller officials who just eke out an existence, to the worn-out fishermen who have to live on the paltry sum of fifty dollars given him by the Government during the present high cost of living and the excessive demands made on him. It would be very much to their credit if the Government take a portion of that indemnity and increase the pay of the old age pensioners to one hundred dollars per year and show them that we are prepared to bear the brunt of the hard times as well as everybody else. They would appreciate it and deserve it. The widow of today must be in a terrible condition. If she barely existed in the past on the small mite she got from the Government, well, surely today she must be suffering terribly, trying to purchase the necessaies of life. That is her position and wll contnue to be hers as long as the same dole is passed to her through the Poor Commssioner's Office. Would it not be the proper act of this new Government, styled the Reform Government and of whom so much is expected, to help the poor of the country and come in and increase the amount of money given to the Old Age Pensioners. It would be a very much better policy on their part if they considered them first before they increased their own salaries from one hundred per cent to five hundred per cent in the instance of the Sessional indemnity. But these actions of the Government are excusable in comparison to those who hold seats in the Upper House. These gentlemen are supposed to be men of independence and of means and simply take their seats for the honor and prestige and great power it gives them in passing the legislation of this country. In looking over the gentlemen of the Upper House not one of them requires or needs compensation for their sevices. I have always wondered why the members of the Uppe House were paid at all. The Government are making a gift to those gentlemen of the higher walks of life and who are generally well-to-do, in making them a salary of two hundred and fifty dollars. It is not the proper course to take, rewarding those gentlemen as legislators, which gives them very valuable prestige , if not in this country, well, aboad, and one can see that it is especially an advantage to the business man who might go aboad and be unknown. The fact of being a Legislative Councillor gives him an entree to places to which otherwise he would have no possibility of at taining, and why a salary is voted to them I am at a loss to know and perhaps will never know. If that money given to those who are members of the Upper House was given to the door-keepers and the reporters and the messengers of the House and those engaged about the House, it would be very much better, because of the object, and that is these men are absoutely dependent on it and they work for it and it ought to be given to them in return, so as to be in some way commensurate with the demands of the present time. Take the Hon. President of the Legislative Council. He is an esteemed gentleman of the community and it is generally understood he has lots of money. The other honorable gentlemen are in much the same position and in no way require to have their sessional indemnity increased something like one hundred per cent. The leader of the Government in the Upper House who hertofore performed that work was a member of the Executive Council can well afford to render his services gratuitously. Why make a present to him of five hundred dollars for the session? His work is merely expressing the wishes or the policy of the Government in the Upper House. The

duties which are his do not warrant the compensation. A person sitting in the Upper House and who has political influence with the Government should be only too glad to accept the duties of Leader of the Government free of charge. I am sure the gentlemen there do not need the money and have made no request for it and is only another instance of the offhanded manner in which the Government is handling the funds of the country. I understand that one of the officials in the Upper House, the Usher of the Black Rod, Mr. Pinsent, has had his salary cut in two. I know Mr. Pinsent and all about his appoint ment there. His father was for many years the custodian of that office, and the present custodian, when his father became sick took up the office without any addtional stipend. When his father died the Government of the day thought it fitting to give the office to the son of a worthy sire. He is a young man struggling to get along, but the Government comes along and cuts his salary in half and doubles the salary of the members of the Upper House. It would have been better for the Government to have told him that his services were no longer required than insult him in this manner.

I see no provsion for increasing the salaries of the officials of this chamber. If the salary of the leader of the Government, of every minister and deputy-minister should be increased, it is also true of the sergeant at-arms, the pages and the reporters. Many officials have been ignored, and some have been dismissed because they had political sympathies with the late Government. I would advise the Government to go slow in that direction. It was tried before, and a storm of resentment arose so that it was stopped. This civil service commission, upon whose recommendation certain increases are made, I venture to say did not recommend that certain officials be dismissed because of political sympahties. It is only in the last few years that any attempt has been made towards reforms in the salaries of civil servants. When it came to a man's salary in the late Government it mattered not what party which he sympathised with so long as he was rendering good service. The Estimates that are before the House are, I suppose, most important owing to the most extraordinary changes that are taking place. We on this side of the House have a serious duty. I know something of how Estimates are brought down. I sympathize with the private members of the Government who have had no opportunity of doing anything with respect to the Estimates. The criticism that has been going on from this side of the House is for the purpose of showing the country how the public monies are expended, and private members of the Government agree with the attitude although unable to express their approval.

It is not my purpose, Mr. Chairman, to hold up the Estimates. I realize that no amendment can be made from this side of the House, but I also realize that there is a duty on every member that he should rise in his place and protest against any extravagance, no matter how small, in the interest of the country. The Minister of Finance has my sympathy in this matter. His first step as Finance Minister in this House is a serious one. He has to find the Ways and Means to meet the huge expenditure of the country, and it will be necessary for him to have a very optimistic mind. For the sake of the country I hope we will be able to afford it. I hope we will see some reduction in taxation so as to reduce the heavy burdens of the people. We are get-

ting back to post-war days and we want to put the people back to a normal condition. We want to get an adjustment of conditions so as to get the confidence of the country, and of other countries. The Finance Minister may have to go abroad very soon to raise funds to meet our bills, and his success will depend very largely upon the figures that are on this paper.

Money was never tighter than it is today, and Newfoundland will need to borrow more money to put her transport facilities in proper condition if we are to safeguard lives of those travelling on our railway, and if the business of the country is to be carried on. Moreover from a government that has promised such reforms as this, much will be expected. Things are bound to change and we cannot expect to have them remain as rosy as the Government seem to think them now. A time is upon us fraught with unpleasant possibilities, and if our products do not realize the prices that we hope, we will, I fear, enter upon dark days. Even in the darkest of days when bad times overtook us and fish was down to four dollars a quintal, the price of flour was also down and our debt was down in comparison; but today conditions are reversed, and the cost of sustenance has gone up 200 per cent. What we must do is increase the earning power of the country; it has wonderful resources and there never was a time when it was more imperative that they should be developed. I warn the Government to go slowly in increasing expenditures before they know where the money is coming from. There is an old saying that it is the last straw that breaks the camel's back. It is our duty to economize, but, at the same time, to give fair play to those who have to get their living from the exchequer of the country. As the votes come up I hope to have an opportunity of dealing with them individually.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress, and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

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

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Mr. Speaker, cn motion for adjournment I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Fisheries what is the program with regard to the salt situation. Does the Government propose to pay the difference between the cost of salt and the price the fishermen are paying for it? An impression has got abroad that no matter what salt costs the fishermen will not have to pay any more than $4 for it. Is the country to understand that the Government is going to pay the difference?

HON. MIN. OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—In reply to the hon. gentleman, I might say that an arrangement has been made whereby the salt that came here by the 'Terra Nova' will be paid for by the fishermen at the rate of five dollars, and whatever the cost is over and above that figure will be paid by the Government. I think the cost of that salt will be about $5.50 or -6.00.

It was moved and seconded that when the House rises it adjourn until to-morrow morning at half past ten of the clock.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

SATURDAY, June 26th, 1920

The House met at ten thirty of the

clock in the forenoon, pursuant to adjournment.

Mr. MacDonnell gave notice of question.

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill respecting the appointment of a temporary Commission for the city of St. John's and that he will move that the Rules of the House be suspended with regard to the stages of such Bill.

On motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the notice respecting the Bill for holding of a Municipal Election in the City of St. John's was withdrawn.

Mr. Walsh asked the Prime Minister to lay on the Table of the House all correspondence between deputies of all departments of the Government (or any department which made recommendations) and the Commissioners appointed by the late Government to adjust the salaries of Civil Servants also all recommendations from deputies of the several departments in relation to increases or otherwise.

Mr. Walsh asked Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the following questions, viz.:

(1) Is the rumor correct that R. T. McGrath, Inspector of Customs, has been suspended from his position.

(2) The cause of such suspension.

(3)) Whether such suspension was ordered after full and impartial enquiry with all the facts bearing on it.

And to lay on the table of this House all correspondence between the Assistant Collector and Minister in relation to this matter.

Further I give notice that I will ask the Hon. Minister of Finance and Customs if it be his intention to order an investigation into the conduct of affairs of the Customs Department to establish the real cause of the disagreement between the Assistant Collector and Inspector of Customs as to the conduct of their departments and relative positions.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. McDonnell gave notice of question.

Hon. Minister of Justice gave notice of motion.

MR. SINNOTT:—Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to the various speeches and criticisms that have come from this side of the House. It is not a matter of consolation or of congratulation to read the Estimates brought down by the Hon. Minister of Finance. You are saddling the country with $2,000,000 extra taxation that must come from the fishermen of the country. You have swooped up the large surplus left by the late Government. If Labrador fish is $8.00 per quintal and shore fish $10.00 where are you going to get the revenue to offset the expenditure demanded by the estimates that you have brought in here? I merely ask these questions that you may give some consideration to the seriousness of this matter. There is no doubt that you have feathered your own nest well. The Executive men have increased their own salaries by $1600.00. I will not make any comment on the salaries received by the Prime Minister. They will be between twelve and fifteen thousand dollars. Before I take my seat, Mr. Chairman, I must protest against this enormous raise in salaries, and I hope that the Government will reduce the amount which it is intended

should be expended over and above last year by at least 50 per cent.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Chairman, before taking up the matter of the estimates I want to place myself on record as being absolutely opposed to the principle that we are now called upon to adopt in this House. The responsible ministers of this House, because there was an election campaign on in Bay de Verde district, deliberately left their seats in the House with the hope that the business of the House would be railroaded through in their absence. I want to endorse the stand taken by my hon. friend Mr. Higgins yesterday, and I want to say that it isn't because that contest is over that they are going to railroad legislation through this House and add $2,000,000 extra to the burdens of the tax payers of the country. As far as myself is concerned my voice will be raised whenever any attempt is made to pass class legislation. And these estimates are class legislation, because the man who already has a large salary is getting an increase. The old age pensioners and the tide waiters are not thought of. They are being absolutely ignored. I think it improper and indecent to let these estimates go through without making some provision for a greater increase in the amount for old age pensions. I remember the time when hon. members who now hold important positions on the Government side of the House who have fell from grace. I refer to the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. On more than one occasion I have heard him train his artillery on the incumbent of the position he now holds. On more than one occasion I have heard him throw his Jack Johnstones at the then Prime Minister, Sir Edward Morris. At that time I supported the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries on behalf of my constituency for the erection of cold storage plants for the preservation of bait and to-day we all realize and must realize that hundreds of thousands of dollars are lost annually to the fishermen for want of this necessity. The district that I have the honour to represent loses thousands of dollars annually for want of bait and the same applies to Burgeo and LaPoile and Burin and other places that I am familiar with, and gentlemen on the other side of the House are fully coignant of the fact that the want of bait is a serious handicap to the fishermen of the whole Island. Not only the men who follow the bank fishery but the shore fishery as well. I have seen as high as twenty vessels lying up in Placentia for want of bait in the height of the fish boom, now what are we going to do to eliminate this condition of affairs? Are we making any serious attempt to improve these conditions? to increase the revenue and earning power of our people. We are doing absolutely nothing, and I take this opportunity while these estimates are being presented to appeal to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I am sure that if he makes up his mind that we are to have a grant of $50,000 for the construction of a bait freezing plant the vote will go through even if he meets with serious objection in the Government because he would have a united Opposition. Any legislation for the benefit of the people generally will have my strongest support. I trust that these few remarks will have some effect on the Hon. Minister. A few days ago we voted the sum of $50,000 so that the price of salt would be kept down and there was no strong protest from this side of the House but the farmers and others of this country should not be called on to pay their share of this tax because if the Dept. of Shipping had been handled properly and the many warnings of Sir John Crosbie and the Leader of the Opposition had been heeded there would

be no necessity of voting this money and it could be used for the establishment of cold storage plants, and even now although we have walked into the pitfall they will eliminate to some extent the indignation and criticism if they will vote a further $50,000 for bait plants, and this is a fifty thousand that may pay for itself in a few years a thousand fold if properly handled. It will increase the earning power of the fisherman 100 to 1000%. Herring may be found in abundance this year and may not be again found for some time. If we had bait plants we could easily stow away some for a rainy day and the same applies to squid and caplin. It can be said of you Mr. Coaker that you made an honest attempt and I trust that you will take these few remarks in the spirit of sincernty. It is perhaps already in the mind of the Minister to erect cold storage plants and I am prepared to give him all the credit. I want none. If he comes in here and votes $50,000 for the erection of bait freezing plants around the Island then I am prepared to give him full and complete credit for it all. If I find that these matters are to be further neglected, I for one, from my place in this House, and on my standing in the district I have the honor to represent, or any district I may be in touch with, I will be fully prepared to give just condemnation, where on the other hand, I would give credit and approval, if I see an honest attempt made to better conditions. I am sorry that the Hon. the Prime Minister, the Colonial Secretary, and the other positions that august gentleman fills, is not here in i shseat emtrPh ieeady. , shrd hr h his seat in this house. I wonder if another political drama is about to be staged, and whether the men who are to play the leading roles are being rounded up this morning. Now that the election in Bay-de-Verde is over, the Hon. the Prime Minister out of common courtesy ought to be here; it is his bounden duty to be here in this House to listen to the criticisms that will be made. I do not feel like hitting a man when he is absent, and it is impossible for me to do my duty to the district which I have the honor to represent, to do my duty to myself, to my associates on this side of the House, or to the thousands of people all over the country who are dependent upon us to express the feeling within them with regard to many public matters, when the Prime Minister is absent from this House. I say for these reasons I would like to see the Prime Minister in his seat in the House today, but I would not be at all surprised that after the criticisms which I intend to make of the Prime Minister and his conduct that I may take up a paper on tomorrow, or Monday or Tuesday, and read where a foul and contemptible attack was made in the House of Assembly upon the Prime Minister by one Walsh, in the absence of the Prime Minister from the House. Well then, why is he absent from the House? I am predicting that this is the kind of hooligan journalism we will be treated to by a section of the Press, and by a small section of the Scribblers. I may say that in justice to all but one of the newspapers in this town, and to all but two or three of the scribllers, and these are on the one paper. Before the closing of the House this session I would like to pay tribute to some of my bitterest political opponents who have been manly enough to deal with issues, and not with personalities, and a better day will come in this colony, a day will dawn when we will have purity in politics; when we will have true brotherhood irrespective of party politics; a day will dawn when the class of man who is now in politics will not find it necessary to retire, and

the class of man who is not in politics today will find it quite possible for him to be able to offer his services to the country without running the risk of having his home desecrated by the class of journalistic crooks and de generates I now refer to, and I must compliment some of the members of the Government for having to a large extent relegated into oblivion the class of men I refer to. I regret that the Prime Minister is not here. However, the remarks I intend to make will not be made with regard to the individual man. In addressing that august seat, the Prime Minister, and Colonial Secretary, and other Commissioners which he represents, and for which he is well paid, I want it to be understood that it is not R. A. Squires as R. A. Squires, that I am referring to.

In his manifesto, placed before the people of the country last autumn, there were very many promises made, some of them placed there, I dare say with the intention, if conditions permitted, of carying them out, but others were put there for the purpose of thowing dust in the eyes of the people, and why I am jusified in coming to that conclusion is, because of the Estimates that we are called upon to pass in this House. In these Estimates we are increasing taxation to a large extent. We are voting two million dollars more than ever before for the Civil Service, and in doing so we are increasing the burden of every householder in the country by forty dollars, and we are doing nothing in any way to help them to meet that extra burden. I asked a question in this House, no, it was outside this House that I asked it, but I repeated it in moving the adjournment of the House that evening, and it had to do with hospital accommodation. In conversation with Mr. Bartlett, who has charge of this particular important branch of the Civil Service, I was told that there were eight hundred applications from the different outports of the country, and no doubt Mr. Chairman, some from your own district, for admission to the General Hospital. In the campaign last Autumn hospitals played a very important part. Personally, if our Government had been sustained and I found that the party with which I was associated would not handle this important matter in a straightforward manner and make provision in the Estimates for the expenditure of sufficient money to warrant further extension of the General Hospital, or better still, the erection of Outport Cottage Hospitals, if I found that the party in any way tried to sidetrack this matter, I would be prepared to leave the party and go over to the Opposition, or take an independent seat in this House. I make that statement in all seriousness. As true as God is over me, if an attempt was made to sidetrack this, one of the most important matters in the island, I would no longer be prepared to associate myself with men who would not do their plain duty. It is now the plain duty of the Government to see that sufficient money is voted for the further extension of the Hospital accomodations. When the past Government went out of office they left a fat surplus of three million dollars. Surely out of part of that money provision could be made in the Estimates for the erection of two or three outport Cottage Hospitals, or the further extension of the General Hospital in St. John's, and while speaking on this matter I would like to endorse what was said here a few days ago by one of my colleagues with regard to paying for treatment received in the General Hospital. It should be made absolutely imperative that any man who can afford it should pay for treatment there, and I take it that the great

majority of our people who are in a position to do so, who are blessed with a large share of this world's goods, resent the idea of going to the General Hospital and receiving treat ment for which they do not pay. I think it is a reflection on the general status of our country to permit such a state of affairs to continue any long er.

I notice in reading the Hospital Report that practically 50 per cent of the patients admitted to the General Hospital come from the city. Now the city of St. John's has its population of some 40,000 and the Island has its population of some 240,000 people. well, then, 200 000 from the outports of the Island have only the same amount of accommodation in the hospital as 40,000 from the city. I do not blame the people in the city, but I commend them; and I want to commend the representatives of the city who have been wide awake enough and energetic enough, and who have been sympathetic enough to their constituents to see that at the expense of all the people of all the other districts that their people have been looked after in the General Hospital. I do not lay any blame to any officials in the hospital because it is their duty to only attend to the patients as they are brought in there, but I do lay blame and I lay blame justly now to the Liberal-Reform administration, who are prepared to vote two millions of dollars to increase our own salaries in this House and to increase the salaries of those who have been already receiving magnificent remuneration for the work they have to perform, and who are prepared to vote large salaries for those who have been used for political purposes; but they are not prepared to vote an additional dollar so that serious illnesses and serious epidemics and untold agony and poverty may be eliminated. Let any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House go out and ring up Mr. Bartlett, the gentleman who is in charge of that branch, and ask him if it is correct that he told me that he had 800 applications from people in different parts of this Island who are suffering from all kinds of afflictions placed upon them by the Almighty Hand. Ask Mr. Bartlett if that statement is correct, and, if it is correct, then ask yourselves and ask your consciences if this is any justification for the two million dollars of an increase —if it is any justification for increasing the salaries of Ministerial jobs by $1600, and if it is any justification for increasing my salary, perhaps the poorest man in this House, from $200 to $1,000. No. I say it is no justification and we should be prepared to give our true Christian sympathy to those people who are afflicted by the Almighty God. I have been in the homes and lived in the homes of the poor. I sprang from poor stock so far as dollars and cents were concerned, but that is the only way the word poor could be attributed to any of mine, and having sprung from the ranks of those who earn their bread by the sweat of their brow, I do know what I am talking about. I know what conditions are like, and I dare say that some of my associates on this side and on the other side of the House, could paint vivid pictures of what conditions are like, especially in the remote and isolated parts of this Dominion. In the district that I have the honour to represent we have a medical doctor at Trepassey; we have no other between Trepassey and St. Mary's. At St. Mary's we have a doctor who, I understand, is about to leave there and be transferred to St. John's. From there we come to Placentia, a distance of about two hun-

dred miles of a coastline. At Placentia we have an old gentleman who has been practising medicine there for over forty years, and let it be said to his credit and to the credit and liberality of the people of Placentia, that altho' Dr. McKendrick is almost the only man not a Roman Catholic in the place—he is a Presbyterian by religious persuasion—that he is one of the best men and the whitest men I have ever met in my life. Though aged and infirm he is still practising medicine. He is suffering from a serious malady which is sapping his energy, but despite that fact he goes on sick calls today. I do not care who the other doctor is that goes to Placentia he is not wanted there until the coppers are laid on the eyes and the lid laid on the coffin of Dr. McKendrick. Good medical men have tried to work up a practice at Placentia. We had Dr. Chisholm who went there and was starved out of it. We had Dr. McDonald, who is now here in the city, and he met with the same result; and we had Dr. Lynch, now of Bell Island, he also had to leave there. I say that this speaks volumes for the liberality and fair-mindedness and true Christian spirit of the good people of Placentia and it will give this House an idea of what this poor old man can do.

We have no other doctor in the district until you go to Marystown, a distance of some 250 miles of a coastline. The doctor there has all the work he can perform without going on sick calls in this bay. The people in the bay have been looking for a doctor but no man could be found to go there. When sickness occurs in the homes, perhaps forty, fifty, sixty or may be a hundred miles, from a place I will leave it to yourselves to picture what conditions are like. A man goes to the nearest telegraph office to wire the member of the district or the official in charge of the Public Health Department when a member of his family is suffering from a disease which he knows nothing about and there is nobody around sufficiently qualified to make any attempt of diagnosing the trouble. In some cases it may be some serious disease that may spread and wipe out valuable lives and cause untold agony and suffering. I say all this would be eliminated if we had an outport Cottage Hospital erected in some section of the district that would be most suitable to the greater number of people. And what applies to the district of Placentia and St. Mary's applies to almost all the other districts in the Island; I feel sure that it applies to the large, long and isolated stretch of coastline in the district of St. Barbe. And what is true of St. Barbe is true of all the other districts. This is a matter that should be taken up by a commission. We have had numerous commissions and, no doubt, we will have some more before the close of this session of the House and before the opening of the next, if there is going to be any next, and surely no more important work could be performed by any commission and I hope that the Government will take this suggestion. They should appoint a commission of men irrespective of party affiliations, a commission prepared to give their time and talents in trying to devise some means whereby this unfortunate state of affairs, that I have just mentioned, can be wiped out. I believe that all the men who constitute the Government party in this House have an honest desire to eliminate those hardships, and I believe that it only needs the painting of the picture in its true colors to the hon. gentlemen who occupy seats in this House to have sufficient influ-

ence brought to bear so as to be able to persuade the Government to adopt these suggestions. Now, I am mapping out a programme in my few remarks this morning, that, if taken into consideration and acted upon, will be a strong lever in bringing about the return of your Government; and I am mapping out a programme that if not acted upon, but relegated to the background, the lever will be used, and used to advantage, with force and consistency by hon. members who may oppose you whatever time another election takes place. Your inaction and nonsupport and lack of sympathy is bound to re-act, and I would advise you to take time by the forelock and do not allow this, your first session, to come to a close, with out having treated those matters which are of vital importance to the whole country, and without having given consideration that each and every item that I have referred to deserves. The vote of two millions of dollars may be justified to some extent, if we were making any serious attempt to give justice and fair play to those of our population who feel that they are no longer able to earn bread, and to those of our population, who through circumstances in a great number of cases, have been reduced to poverty.

I referred to this matter on a previous occasion, but when I made the reference the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was absent and I still have some confidence despite what I hear and see; I still have some confidence in that honorable Minister for some sympathy and some justice for the poor people of this country. If he is prepared to do that here is an opportunity for some sympathy to be displayed by him in a practical way. The increase to the widows and orphans under the Estimates is insignificant; and to do any good to the poor widows who are struggling along and may be trying to support three or four children who are helpless, on the paltry sum of five or six dollars per quarter. Surely a part of the nest-egg left the Minister of Finance by the late Government ought to be contributed to the widows and orphans and increase their miserable pittance at least two hundred per cent. I would like to ask the honourable members of this House what is it they can purchase for the paltry sum of twenty dollars per year? Some of these widows are absolutely dependent upon their neighbor for their existence, and if the conditions prevailing now throughout the whole country are considered, the neighbor who has all to do for himself and family will not be able to render any assistance, and there are numerous cases in this country where little children are unfed and unclothed. There are numerous cases in this country, not confined to any particular section of it either, where this is to be found. Why you need not leave the city of St. John's to find numerous cases where the people are in absolute poverty. I mean the widows and orphans. It is true there are some charitable institutions here but these are not all together of themselves able to cope with the large demands that are made upon them from time to time, and it is incumbent upon this House, especially now, when you come in here and ask the members to give their support to an addition of two million of dollars in the Estimates. I say it is indecent, absolutely indecent, and each and every individual member of this House knows and every individual member of the community knows that this is so especially so when you ask us to increase our own salaries and that of

the Prime Minister from twenty-four hundred dollars to I do not know what—that all depends upon the number of jobs he will have, and, in the face of this to ignore the poor widow inflicted by the Almighty. whose husband perhaps may be one of the men who played a prominent part in making it possible for a roof to remain over this Assembly, or ovor any other institution in this country. I say it is a reflection on the honesty, and charitableness, and Christian spirit of which we should have evidence in this Chamber, and it should be found to a greater extent in those Ministers who are now able to enjoy all the luxuries they personally require and bye and bye, in the dying hours of this Assembly, they will make another appeal to their constituents and say what they will do when they get back, but it will be a repetition of this present camouflage in the eyes of the public. We are passing through an era that is the most epoch-making in the history of this Island, we are passing through a period which is the same the world over —during which we are trying to get back to pre-war conditions. The road is rough and on it difficulties will be found, and also, many obstacles, and it is only by wisdom that these obstacles can be overcome. What are we doing for the men, who, by their patriotism and devotion to duty and heroic response to the call of the Empire, to use the words of a greater man than myself, and perhaps greater than any man in this House, "Made it posible to have Newfoundland placed on the map of the world." What are we doing for them? We know what we are doing to the country, and we know what we are doing to the people, who, in just indignation, gave public expression to their feelings some time ago here. There has been gross indifference and criminal negligence towards those who fought and bled for us. I had hoped in the opening days, on the first day this House opened, when the Speech from the Throne was being replied to by the Address and when it was moved and seconded by our two gallant friends on the other side with magnificent addresses, for something, and I made up my mind that the Returned Soldiers had two good champions on the Government side of the House, but I am somewhat disappointed, and I find that despite all that I expected from the Liberal-Reform Government that what had been done for the Returned Soldiers by the expenditure of one hundred and fifty thousand dollars is now cut off in the Estimates. So this is the treatment that is handed out to the men who were satisfied to make untold sacrifices themselves. It does not always follow that because certain individuals who were part of the Newfoundland Regiment have been elevated to a higher plane, it does not follow because some of them have secured positions of emolument in the Civil Service, that these returned men are being done justice. Go to the rank and file, to the father whose eyes are still dimmed with tears and the poor mother and sister whose eyes also well up with tears because of the loss of their sons and brothers during the war. I can cite cases in my district where three and four have gone from the one house in defense of this country. I can cite cases where men have gone over there and bled in the heat of the day, and who have fought on Gallipoli, in France and Flanders, but when they returned how do they stand? Because of the criminal neglect and indifference of the Liberal-Reform Government they have been compelled to make their homes in a

foreign country. As I stated the other day, I met one of the best men who served in the Naval Reserve, in the person of a Mr. Wareham, from Placentia. He has a brother well up in the religious life of the country. This man is well qualified for any position, because of his ambition and industry. This gentleman friend of mine had political pull with my opponents, and I did not turn him down because he was politically opposed to me when he came to me for assistance. My attitude about it is: that when the last ballots were cast the whole matter is closed until the next election. I have always treated my opponent with the same courtesy and respect as I treat my friends. This man made application for a position on one of the steamers that are coming out here. I do not know which one it will be. He went around from door to door of each department so as to speak of the Civil Service, and I met him after this and he said, "Walsh I have bought a ticket for New York, and when the next European War breaks out you will have to fight for yourselves, and tell Mr. Squires, or any of his associates, that he will have to go over and do the fighting. We are not going to do it." He cannot be blamed one bit for this. Men like this man have gone to the United States to forswear their allegiance to the British Crown. This is a serious state of affairs brought about by the criminal neglect of the Government. This indignation has echoed from the Atlantic to the Pacific and the day will come when the political heeler will not be able to come in and take charge of the men who have honestly and bravely fought in defense of our country. It may be said that this is political criticism but that is not the case. If you are prepared to give justice and equality to those men you will have my absolute support, and I will say that any criticism that may emanate from this side of the House against any vote of this nature I will resent, and so, before it is too late, and now before the Estimates pass the House, let this matter, that I have referred to, be given serious consideration in the Estimates. I have referred to the Old Age Pensions, the Regular Pensions, the Cold Storage, Outport Hospitals, the Widows and Orphans, and now I am speaking about the Returned Soldiers. These are matters of vital importance, and matters which the community expect to be attended to. As the Leader of the Opposition was not present I will re-state, for his information now, what I have said. But I do not anticipate any objection from him on this matter. I will support an increased vote for the Returned Soldiers, and if the Government are prepared to come in here and augment this one hundred and fifty thousand dollars, which has been taken from them, with another one hundred and fifty thousand, I will give my wholehearted support to the measure, and if there is any opposition to that from this side of the House I will strenuously oppose it. And my reason for this support is because of the fact that there are numerous cases where the loss of a son or sons to a father not alone caused him a great shock but the death of them has cast a sorrow upon those fathers that will incapacitate them for the balance of their days.

I know that from personal observation with several of my friends. There is one case of a gentleeman living near Freshwater, Placentia Bay. He had three sons who volunteered their services to their country. One was missing after the July drive, and instantly another brother took his

place, and the sadness was all the greater when on the very day of the signing of the Armistice the second son went down. The father is in very good health physically, but what consolation has the Gvoernment given to that father? I say it is the duty of the Governmen of this country if we are going in any way to show a just appreciation of the great services rendered by the young manhood of the country, if we are going to show a just sympathy to their dependents, to see that they get their rights. Now that the agitation is sarted in the proper way and by the proper men it is our duty to stand by these men. Before departing from this particular subject I would like to read a satement from the Conadian press, dated June 19th.

Now, as I said, Mr. Chairman, in the early part of my speech on behalf of the returned men, this is one of the courses that we could adopt The Hon. Minister of Justice dealt yesterday with how legislative matters are dealt with in Canada. Now I refer to how Canada is dealing with her returned men. Appoint a committee, but do not make that committee a political tool. This statement from the Canadian Press says further:

Now, Mr. Chairman, it has been found necessary in the Dominion of Canada to make large increases for the returned men. The conditions in Canada are somewhat similar to what we have at home. There is absolutely no justifiiation for the attitude of the Government toward the men who were spoken of as "better than the best." I would like to make a strong plea that the vote to the re- u nedtrmeehbn gaevoah mf mf m m turned men be augmented by $160,000, and I feel sure this will be done when the Government are convinced that the Opposition and the Government are one in their sympathy for the dependents of the gallant heroes.

Mr. Chairman, whilst we were prepared to come in here and ask for these enormous increases for the several departments, whilst we were pre pared to come in here and increase the salary for the depattment heads from $2400 to $4000, and the deputy heads to $3600, in the case of men who have motor cars and swell homes we have absolutely ignored the poor official no matter what his station or occupation in life. He is left just where we found him "at the foot of the mountain brow." The hon. the member in charge of the Estimates has stated that the Estimates as far as the increases were concerned were based on the recommendation of the commission. We find now that this is true only in so far as it effects the men who are already well paid.

When we adjourned for lunch I was endeavouring to point out to this House, and to the country, what I consider to be a discrimination, and a large and serious discrimination, in several of the votes that we are asked to pass, in these Estimates, for a certain section of our people. Whilst we are prepared to ignore absolutely a certain section, which is just as important, to me, and just as important if not more so, to the country generally, and I wish to emphasize the fact, that any legislation that is attempted to pass through this House, or that may be attempted in any House, which savors of class legislation, is unworthy of the support and sympathy of a great many of the mem bers of this House. I tried to point out the serious lack of consideration that has been given to some of the most important branches of our industries by men we expected more from.

Now let us take the Department of Agriculture and Mines. This is a department over which I had control

for a short period, and, I think, in all fairness, that every individual member of this House will admit that my time in that office was not of sufficient length, and that the conditions under which I was laboring, when I took up the performance of my duties there, were not such to warrant the improvement that I would like to see in that particular branch of the Civil Service. With regard to its agricultural efforts I would like to say that I do not pose as an agriculturist in any sense of the word, but I have sufficient knowledge to be absolutely convinced that the expenditure of thirty-five thousand dollars of the people's money by a man who represents nobody, a man who was not elected by the people, and I venture to predict will never occupy a seat in the Chambers of this Asembly, is not right. It is criminal to hand over to that man for expenditure, as he thinks fit, thirty-five thousand dollars of the people's money; and I also venture to predict that there will not be thirty-five cents return for it. This Model Farm will be used as a place where the political friends of the Government will be able to go and get a particular brand of: ram, or cat, or hen; but so far as the people of Bonavista Bay, or Trinity Bay, or any other outport are concerned, there will be no return, there will not be five cents worth of value come back for this expenditure. If you had taken that money and added it to the salary of the poor, added to the dole handed out to the widow and the orphan there might have been some excuse, and I for one would have endorsed such a step and hold over Dr. Campbell's fad for a Model Farm until such a time as the country had an opportunity to recuperate from the stress of the times we are now passing thru', and the worse times I see in the near future, unless the Divine hand of Providence intercedes to save us. I say, that in consideration of the extraordinary times we are passing through, it ill becomes any honourable gentleman to come in here and ask us to throw away thirty-five thousand dollars for such a purpose. The Minister of Finance and Customs seems to be pleased. Perhaps if Dr. Campbell had been a defeated colleague of mine I might be delighted too, and I might be prepared to support this movement if it would be the means of getting me back to power some time later, but not when we are facing the serious conditions we are up against today, not when we see nothing ahead but bankruptcy, unless conditions change and change quickly unless, as I stated before, it is a deliberate attempt to scuttle the ship, unless that is the case, there is a lack of that wise legislation that has been in evidence ever since we have had Responsible Government in this country. Even if this thirty-five thousand dollars had been distributed fairly and equally in the purchase of seeds to be distributed throughout the different districts, we would have a return, and a direct return, and we would make good interest on the thirty-five thousand dollars. I don't know what conditions are like in Bonavista Bay and Trinity Bay, with regard to seed potatoes, whether all the poor people there receive potatoes. I see Mr. Targett smiling, but I don't know whether his constituents will not find themselves up against it.

MR. TARGETT:—Yes, we have potatoes in Trinity Bay.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Targett says that they have potatoes. That is a happy position, and I hope it is correct, but I have my doubts. I know, and I have it on the authority of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines,

that they have had numerous requests from all parts of the Island for encouragement of seed potatoes, and what they decided to d owas to have these potatoes supplied through the Relieving Officer. I don't know whether any hon. member's district was supplied through that channel, but I protested as far as my constituency was concerned. I would not have them dragged down to the level of paupers by having any such encouragement given them in that manner. Next Autumn will tell the tale, when the crops are taken from the ground, and I hope the condition of affairs will not exist which does exist today, when the poor people are called upon to pay forty and fifty cents a gallon for potatoes, and I predict that fifty per cent. of the people, and that is a large percentage, will not be able to take out of the ground sufficient to tide them over the Winter. Well, then, it will be poor encouragement for these people to take up a paper and read where there are a half dozen Short Horn Cows, or Bulls, or a half dozen Short Tail Cows or Bulls, on Dr. Campbell's Model Farm. If this suits the hon. members of the Government it is none of my business, and if it suits any gentleman that is his own business; but I want to tell you that it will not suit or satisfy the constituency I have the honor to represent in this House, and it is because I know that it is an absolute injustice to these people who have to toil from morning to night, from daylight to dark, it is because of that, that from my proper place in this Assembly, I want to raise my voice in protest against any such extravagant juggling of the public funds. I only wish that I could use stronger words.

MR. SAMSON:—Will the poor people receive potatoes?

MR. WALSH:—If you have anything to say to me, say it so that I can hear it, or get up when I have finished and air your views on the matter. Now that we are seriously handicapped with regard to our staple industry, now that conditions that had prevailed in this country, have changed, now that our staple industry, that was selling a few months ago at fourteen and fifteen dollars a quintal, is down to five dollars a quintal, now that we have no positive and absolute proof that it is not going to remain at that figure, it is our duty to look around, it is the duty of this House, it is the duty of each and every member of this House to look around and see if we cannot find some auxiliary industry to assist the fishery.

I, for one, am a firm believer that if we got any encouragement from any administration, or if any honest attempt was made by any Government, that we can unfold countless thousands of dollars of wealth never before touched; I refer to our mineral wealth. And, as I stated on other occasions in this House, when referring to that particular branch of our industries, I speak with experience. Take any of the mines that were ever worked in this country and go back to the history of how they started and you will find that there is not one of them but was found by accident, absolutely found by accident. The old copper mine in Little Bay, down in Notre Dame Bay, was found by accident by an old gentleman who lived some four or five miles away from Little Bay, who was up shooting. I do not know what class of game he was after, but I know that he was climbing over the hillside when he uncovered the moss from the mineral, and, gentlemen within the hearing of my voice, now know this is absolutely correct, no matter how they might

smile at the statement. And the same applies to the other list of mines that were discovered here. Take the Bell Island mines, the richest mines of that particular brand of mineral in the world, a mine that Germany would pay millions and billions of dollars to get control of. Some of the ore of that mine, so we were led to believe, played an important part in the assassination and murder of lots of our own men in the nature of German bullets. People in this country fifty years ago used to use the ore at Bell Island as ballast for their boats.

Now I do not want to indict the present Government any more than the past Government, but at the pres ent time when the country is crying out for the opening up of other industries and when numbes of our young men are packing their bags and boxes and when every train and every boat that leaves here carries our manhood away to other countries, well, is it not our duty and the duty of this House of Assembly to try and open up other industries that would be the means of keeping our men at home. These men by their daily aoil are building up the institutions of other countries. A large percentage of them will never come back. There are as many Newfoundlanders now in the State of Massachusetts as there are living in the whole of this country. This was brought about by our own people having been driven from their own country and the Liberal-Roform Government are prepared te come in and continue the driving out. We are not making the slightest attempt to keep our people at home. I would like to see in thos Estimates a vote for $50,000 for a start and to have some reliable and competent man engaged to go into the hillside or the valley where there is any indication that mineral may bee found and make an honest attempt of finding out our mineral possibilities. Geologists in the past have reported favorably on the mineral condition of this Island, but because of the fact that we have had no Geological Surveyor in recent years, capitalists are shy about coming in to invest their money and because of unscrupulous characters who have gone outside this country with nothing but a map in their possession; they went on Wall Street and other streets and tried to sell properties that never existed. Such characters have gone to Canada and the United States and it is because of the numerous black eyes given this country by fakirs, capitalists are shy about coming here with their money. I am glad to notice that provision is made in the Estimates for a Geologist. One of the things that I did do while I was in that department was to open up correspondence with at least three geologists, with a view to having a good man, a man who will thoroughly understand the geology of the western countries, and I hope that when the Government decides to make the selection that they will not engage some gentleman who has spent most of his professional career in an Orient al college, but I hope that it will be some man who has had some experience in the Continent of North America and I hope will be some man who is not too old to get out into the country, and I further express the hope that he will be staffed with men, patriotic, honest men, not political heelers from any side of politics, but men who have an honest desire to try and do something that will be for the betterment of conditions for themselves, their families and their countrymen. And if such a vote was placed in the Estimates to try and explore a section of the country this year, $50,000 probably would be too much, but say $20,000 for a start, I

would gladly give it all the encouragement and all the assistance I can. I might say that I have some little information about different sections of the Island, and I would be only to pleased to assist that geologist and assist that department, if I am convinced that an honest attempt is being made to try and uplift our common country. I would like to speak on that particular branch of our industries for quite a long time, but I do not want to in any way obstruct the business of this House. The mineral branch of our industries is a subject that I could easily interest the members of this House in for quite a period.

If the Government are prepared to throw politics to the wind I am prepared to give all the assistance I am able to this particular branch of our industries. I have to express again my regret of the absence of the leader of the House. I cannot for the life of me understand how this honourable gentleman can expect his estimates to receive the consideration they deserve if after being away campaigning down in Bay de Verde for the past week he still vacates his seat this afternoon. Transportation is another important matter which occupied a prominent place in the forecast of the Government policy. What have they done? What have the Government done despite the fact of voting two millions of dollars extra? What have they done with regard to it? The echo answers not. The railway has not been touched and that is a most important part of our transportation. And the Prime Minister intimated to the House some few evenings ago that no attempt would be made to bring down any legislation relative thereto this session. The Minister of Posts and Telegraphs from his place here in the House warned the country that our railroad was not safe to travel over and he is there now and he can contradict if he can. He himself from his official place in this House warned the people that our railroad was not fit for a human being to travel over. Now what has the present Government done to remedy this condition of affairs? It has been in power for eight months. We have been in session for just two months and the session is now in its dying hours and no legislation has been brought down in this House. I think it is an unfortunate state of affairs. I can quite agree with the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs that the conditions are serious with regard to our railroad and when the conditions are such why does not the Government tackle the problem and bring down legislation and if necessary vote some millions of dollars to effect the necessary repairs of re-construction to the railroad. Now is the time to tackle that work. It would be to your credit to do so but you are not big enough, not honest enough to deal with this matter and deal with it promptly. We heard a lot of criticism during the last campaign with regard to the Reids, the railroad and the coastal boats but I am afraid it is the same old story and the public are beginning to think it is the same old story. That kind of criticism may be able to send you back to the House but we are getting tired of that kind of stuff and it would be to your credit to make an honest attempt to safe-guard the lives of our people. This is a most serious matter and I would not wish to be in the shoes of the Honourable Minister of Posts and Telegraphs if an accident occurred on the railroad which I hope to God wont and hope it will not while the Minister is in power or even before the Government tackles the problem. We must expect that the people will realise that that statement of the Minister's was not made with honesty of purpose. Now I would not believe that the hon-

ourable gentleman was not honest. But what I do find fault with is that he and his party does not take some steps to do something. There is another matter of vital importance and I would like to know what attitude the Government intends to take with regard to the signatures of fifteen thousand people all over the Island. This is the matter of Prohibition. Prohibition occupied a prominent place in the manifesto of the leader of the Government and the question of Prohibition occupies at the present time a prominent place in the conversation of lots of places all over the country and if reports are correct occupied a prominent place in the campaign just closed in the district of Bay de Verde and it is to the effect that motor cars were commissioned with the necessary cheer and it was given out in cases. I make the statement for what it is worth. A whole lot of people say so and a whole lot of people believe it. But what about the fifteen thousand persons who petitioned this House for a modification of the Act and that matter bears heavily upon a certain class of people. It does not bear on some. There are men in this House who can get as many scripts as they want. And that is no secret to the members of this House. I am not one of these. There is a lot of people here who can get them when they wish and in any manner they like as the Minister of Finance well knows. But what about this petition to the House?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—I would like to ask the honourable the member if he infers that the members of this House got prescriptions from my Department or from me personally?

MR. WALSH:—I do not accuse you of issuing them. You can get them though. That is a fine condition of affairs to exist and if the statement of the Minister is correct it is a direct violation of the Act and it should not be allowed.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—I would like to point out to the honourable member that I can get them when I am sick.

MR. WALSH:—Certainly you can get ten bottles.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—I can get ten bottles when I am sick.

MR. WALSH:—That is camouflage. You are not going to put that down the throats of the public.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—No members on this side issued scripts for the Government.

MR. WALSH:—Yes, Dr. Campbell does all the issuing.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—He issues them in his official capacity.

MR. WALSH:—The Minister of Agriculture and Mines is well able to look after the sick list.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—So is Dr. Jones.

MR. WALSH:—Now that this has been brought up by the Minister of Finance I would like to tell the House that it would be well for the country if a few of those who have the handling of scripts handle the matter with such care an dthought for those who are the victims as does Dr. Jones. I make this statement without fear of contradiction that I have never in my life asked or received a script for any amount of liquor from the Doctor and I am able to bear that out on oath if necessary. Now coming back to the subject, it is not good enough to ignore the requests of fifteen thousand persons with regard to the modification of the present Act The plebiscite was granted the country on a far less number of signatures and the honorable gentlemen who represent the Northern districts know how difficult it is to get this stimulant under pres-

ent iniquitous Act, and they know that material is manufactured which is not fit for human consumption. Why it is their duty to come to the rescue of their constituents and do away with the manufacture of moon-shine in the different sections of the Island and these representatives have not raised their voices in protest despite the fact that these representatives have time after time presented petitions on behalf of their constituents for a modification of the Act. Perhaps they have inside information from the Prime Minister that the necessary remedy will be effected. But still why not have they made some protest with regard to this matter. The peoples of this town and every other town and village are dissatisfied with the present Act as it is now carried out. If we are to have Prohibition, let us in God's name have it properly, and not have this hypocrisy carried on by this House and the member sof this House and outside this House. There are nu merous men who, after the exertions of the day, now have no stimulant to take, while those sitting around us here may have. There is no considera tion for the man who was always used to having aglass of port before retiring. It is poor consolation to him to know that Mr. Walsh, Mr. Brownrigg or Mr. Squires had his drink before turning in. But words are not strong enough to denounce the man who used it and injured his home or the public. We hoped that before this session this matter would be taken up and not winked out of sight. Let a bill be brought in for a modification and close up the Controller's, or the manufacture and importation should be absolutely prohibited. One thing or the other should be done. A great majority of the people of the country want a modification of the Prohibition Act. They are not satisfied with present conditions. The people say that in the manifesto of R. A. Squires we were promised a modification of the Prohibition Act, and in this respect at least he should carry out his manifesto

There is another matter that I must refer to before taking my seat. Some time ago I asked the Hon. the Leader of the House if he intended to bring in any labor legislation. I would say to the Hon. the Leader of the House that this is too important a mattter to give to any of the present departments of the Government. You should create a new Department. Mr. Chairman, I would ask you to take a look behind the curtain and see the situation with regard to labor. Go down on the wharves, on Bell Island in the mines, go insid ethe factories. Look at the litttle children trying to support the invalid mother or father. Look at the unsanitary conditions. I drew the attention of this House some time ago to another accident on Bell Island. It is a matter of fact that men have been accidentally discovered dead on Bell Island; their boots or clothes dug up. And this is because we have not the proper Government inspection. I call to the attetntion of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice that a com petent man should be appointed to look into this matter and try to remedy con ditions. Shortly after taking office of Minister of Agriculture and Mines I went to Bell Island and discussed this matter with the authorities of both Companies, and the Companies are as one with the Government in any effort to preserve the minds and lives of their employees. Whatever party I as sociate myself with, if a department of Labor is not created before the next general election, it will be one of the agreements between me and the party that such a department be created, and it will not be a political dumping ground. Now, Mr. Chairman, there are some other gentlemen here who have a word or two to say, and I will

defer any further criticism for a later date. The remarks that I have made here otday have been for the informa tion of the gentlemen, the salaried gen tlemen, who saw fit to vacate their seats during the Bay-de-Verde political campaign.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Chairman, I was ab sent from the House when the Hon. Minister tabled the Estimates. In this connection let me say that the cam-paign in Bay-de-Verde District was one that reflects no discredit on the Op position, and, so far as I know, no dis credit on the Government. It was a hard fight and a clean fight ,one that put a lot of nervousness in the hearts of the Government members. We may not have won, but I take it we gave the Government a run for their money. I Wish, Mr. Chairman, to tender my sin-cere congratulations to the returned member. In the downfall of John C. Puddester the Opposition and the coun try have lost a valuable man. During the entire campaign he fought, early and late. He was on the job every minute. The Hon. gentlemen oppos-ite smile at my remarks.

HON. MIN. OF PUBLIC WORKS: —Mr. Chairman, I have noticed that every time any preson on this side of the House smiles the Hon. member takes it as an insult. Surely it hasn't come to it that we can't smile on this side of the House. I want to assure the hon. member that it was not meant as an insult.

MR. FOX:—In reply to the Hon. Minister I would say that the time was when the Hon. Ministers of the Govern ment could not afford to smile. As I was about to say, Bay-de-Verde has lost a good man, and as I told them in Bay-de-Verde I don't want to rub shoulders with a better man. I be-lieve that there is not a man from Freshwater to Bay-de-Verde he does not know, and among them he has a large number of friends. But when it falls to the year of grace 1920 we find that men come back through gold to earn their salaries. In the good old days we had $200 a year, just suffici-ent to meet our expenses, a mere nom inal indemnity, and today we have the indecent spectacle of the Government bringing in an Act to provide $1000 for its members, and God knows what is going to happen the country. If we were assured of our financial stab-ility and had a credit on the right side of our books I would say if it is ne-cessary increase the Ministerial salary and there might be some excuse for doubling the salaries, but there are people in this country to-day who can-not tfind a crust to eat and the Govern ment comes in here today and takes $1000 and puts it into their own pock-ets. I suppose if the Hon. Minister of Finance were here today he would say that the report of the commission is re sponsible for these increases. In re-ference to the increases and decreases in the Civil Service I have not much to say but I think that there has been grave discrimination exercised, and a sorry day has come to Newfoundland when we have to realize that only poli-tical supporters get remunerative in-creases. If these Civil Servants are being penalized it's a two-edged sword that touches both ways, and our own experience leads us to know that past governments who used this kind of discrimination never got over the disrepute into which they had been thrown for such action. I want to point out to the Government that they are not broad enough to acknowledge that this is a free country and that every man is entitled to his free expres sion of opinion and exercise of fthe mind that God gave him. If you are going to penalize the men who have different ideas than those which you have, then all I have to say is God help this Government. Now in com-menting on the Estimates there is one

item there concerning the report of the commission which the Government has probably lost sight of. We were told that when a Minister of the Crown holds two or more positions he should not receive more than $6,000 per year but today we find that the Prime Minister is comfortably placed in three positions tha tbring him in the nice little sum of $9,000. In the olden days Sir Robert Bond got $2,000 as Colonial Secretary and was content to occupy his position in honor and glory to him self and of benefit tohis country. But we are now come to a free pass when the Leader of the Government comes in here to carry out his surname of Liberal and dips down into the Treasury to fatten his own bank account. We have reports here now upon which we have been working for every night, noon and morning, with what result? The Government members merely come in here and look at each other and say nothing. If any one of them said a word they would be ex communicated. You refuse to give the men who are slaving for this House the salary that does not pay them for the time that they are losing down here. I know what it is to come down here and sit up in that box and copy speech after speech. When they pro tested a few days ago, what was the Government's reply. If there is any official in this House who deserves a substantial increase it is the reporter, and these men are what I call penalized, and when they protested a few short days ago, we had the interesting spectacle of the Leader of the Govern ment bringing down a gentleman with a staff I don't know where he got this staff, but I suppose it was from his office, to take the places of these men who only exercised their rights, when seeing that the salaries of the members were being increased so much, said: "The laborer is worthy of his hire, and we want ours." And because they dared to raise their voices in protest they were told to get out if they were not satisfied, and were practically forced to take up the job again. Then take the Clerk of this House. The gentleman who is conscientiously working at his duty in this House three hundred and fifty-five days out of the year, his salary is not increased. Oh no. Every increase to any official in this House meant so much less to increase our own salaries, and we have men on the other side of the House who are contented with that, and they call themselves honorable gentlemen of this House. If you increased your own salary and then turned round and did a good turn for the men who are working for you it would be as much as could be expected, but when you take everything for yourselves and leave nothing for the man who is doing your work for you, you have a small ideaof your duty. Then we come to the Upper Chamber. In the old days gentlemen were always found to take charge of the Government bills that were referred to that House for the honor of the thing, and today we have to pay a man to take that position; and we find that one official of that House, a man who occupies a position of honor, the Usher of the Black Rod, a man whose position stands for much in every country where the British constitution is in force, is decreased. You take two hundred dollars off his salary and add it on to the leader of the Government in that Chamber. What is the intention of the Government? Do they want to drive him out of that position? He and his father before him have done yeoman service in that position, and done credit to themselves and to the House, and it falls to this Government to penalize him and reduce his salary instead of increasing it as they should have done. The same thing applies right through the place. The men who

are doing the work are neglected and the people who are getting the benefit of the work are benefitting themselves and passing over them. Two million dollarss of an increase in the Estimates when Newfoundland is facing the most serious situation she has ever faced; when the staple industry of the country is in such a bad state, the thing upon which Newfoundland de pends for her very life, at a time when it takes four quintals of fist to buy a barrel of flour, and a half a quintal of fish to buy a gallon of molasses. This is the way the Government is reducing taxation. A lot of declarations were made last year to the people. It was stated that one dollar was only worth twenty(-eight cents, but that there would be a change if the present Government were returned, and we were told in Bay-de-Verde the other day that not alone was that dollar consumed, but that inroads are being made on the second dollar, and still the Government bring in an increase of two million dollars in the Estimates.

The Government is taking a lot of credit to themselves because they are saving the fisherman fifty thousand dol lars on salt. They have put glaring headlines in the papers showing them selves as saviours of the fishermen, be cause they have taken over the respon sibility of that fifty thousand dollars. Four weeks ago Sir John Crosbie warned the Government of the seriousness of the salt situation, and the Government told him that it was none of his business, that they would attend to that. He sat down and three weeks after he rose again and asked the Government what had been done in the mat ter, and they said—We have discussed the matter carefully. We have stayed awake nights thinking it over, and we recognize that the situation is serious; and he said that if the members of the Executive Government, instead of stay ing awake nights thinking it over, had come down to his office that he would have settled the whole matter in half an hour. It is through the fault of the Government that the fishermen are in the position they are in today with regard to salt, and they blame the strike in Cadiz for it. In 1918 and 1919 when we had given our cargo-ships to Russia and other allies in order to carry on the war work, we faced the same situation and the Government that was then in power sent over to England and asked them to commandeer ships to take up their work and that was done in order to obtain salt, and the fact that the Government have aken over the responsibility of the fifty thousand dollars does not excuse them, because every dollar that they pay for the fisherman means another dollar out of the fisherman. It is class legislation. It is discrimination of the worst kind. It is not a loss that you will save the fisherman from when you shoulder the burden of that fifty thousand dollars, because you merely take it out of one pocket and put it in to another. If the people of this country are foolish enough to believe your statement, then they are foolish enough to believe anything. Two million dollars increase and the Ministerial salaries doubled, and the pay of the Government members in this House in creased 500 per cent, and where are the Widows and Orphans of Newfound land? Where are the men who went across and were prepared to sacrifice everything for the country? What about the promises that were made wit hregard to these men, that nothing was too good for them, and they would never be forgotten? They are forgotten, and we have today practically the same conditions we had after the Crimean War; those men who went across and sacrificed everything are practically selling shoelaces on the cor ners. Is it any wonder that these men should go to the Government and ask

them to carry out their promises? They did not ask you to make them, they did not want you to make them, bue when you did make them, they want them carried out. All that they want is British justice. But when they asked this the answer was, we have not enough money for you, we cannot do anything for you if we double our own salaries. You come last. Is it any wonder that these men should rise in revolt against that treatment. They take the Widows and Orphans. You can put up your own salaries, and add 500 per cent to the salaries of the members of the House, but do you add one cent to the Old Age Pension of men who spent their lives in service of Newfoundland, going down to the seats in boats and catching fish that meant Newfoundland's preservation. Have you thought of the old woman who spent her whole life in building up the same industry? You vote ten thousand dollars to the Old Age Pensions and that will not go towards increasing the annual pension of any one person. You will not give these people anything that will keep them from being paupers. Because when you give $50 a year to an old worn-out fisherman you are only handing him a gilt-edged insult. If you took that two million dollars and gave one million of it or if you had made the increased vote four millions and gave two millions of it to these worthy Newfoundlanders then you might be able to come here and face this House with some degree of pride; but when you come here and fail to carry out your pre-election promises and disgrace those Estimates and disgrace our public accounts by multiplying your own salaries and neglecting those worn-out Newfoundlanders, who built up your country, and neglecting the men who put this country and you where you are today, then you are doing something that can only be considered discreditable to yourselves. Fifty dollars a year for old worn-out fishermen. Why it would not get a man two barrels of flour every six months.

We read in the days gone by in November last and particularly during the Fall campaign of charges of graft aganst the then administration and how certain men waxed fat at the public expense. Those charges were made by the then Opposition. But these same men who were villified then had the proud satisfaction of leaving a substantial credit behind them. Those charges were not due to any member of the late party and those members of that party who became rich acquired their riches through the shrewd exercising of their own ability and to legitimate businesses. And th efallacy of those charges were afterwards proven. The Auditor-General was notified by the present Government that the books containing the record of the late administration were to be left at the disposal of special accountants who were brought here from the United States to audit our books. Of course in the opinion of the present administration Newfoundlanders had not sufficient ability to do this kind of work. A great deal of the work of the imported commission consisted of checking and measuring coal that went into the General Hospital. The Commissioners went there and asked to see if the Institution was receiving the amount of coal that it should. Their work also comprised the counting of potatoes in some of our public institutions, and to see that the inmates therein were not wasting any.

The Commissioners found nothing as a result of their investigations; they practically told the Government that they had shamefully misrepresented the past administration and deluded the people of this country. In consequence of the practise of this experiment we have, and the whole of this

country have, to shoulder the payment of another $25,000. A pretty costly experiment to say the least of this or any other administration, and I hope that the Government will take good care not to repeat the experiment.

In the Estimates I find nothing deal ing with that burning question—the need of a reformatory in Newfoundland. I asked the question a short time ago and the leader of the Govern ment told me that the matter was being gone into by the Government. But the Government knows there is necessity for a Reformatory in St. John's and every member of the Government knows that juvenile offenders are becoming dyed-in-the-wool criminals be cause of their associations in the Penitentiary with experienced and harden ed criminals. Children who are sent to the common jail on conviction of twopenny half-penny charges, come out with the mark of Cain on their foreheads, because that stigma will probably always remain with them, and we have not a single cent voted or asked to be voted in this House for the establishment of a House of Correction or Reformatory for the juvenile offend ers that we have. Look at other countries. What are they doing in this mat ter to safeguard and to see that their morals are protected. If they have got any wayward children they have Houses of Correction to put them in and because it is the duty they owe to themselves and their country. We have juvenile offenders who have to face the Bar of the Magistrate's Court children who should be under their mothers' care if they had any, and if they had nobody else to look after them should be taken under the care of the Government, turned out like curs and sent down there to the Lake side to consort with men who are serv ing terms for most heinous offences. Such children are imprisoned for the most trivial offences and when they come out never forget their entry. The Government has seen well not to take up that question and in this connection I would like toask why the vote for Child Welfare has been reduced. Is there not a necessity for keeping that vote where it was and in fact for increasing that vote. Does the Minister in charge of the Estimates think that this question of Child Welfare need not be seriously regarded? We talk about building up our city and our Newfoundland, but we forget that the people we will have to depend upon in years to come in this country and who will direct this country's affairs we ar eneglecting now. The vote for that very necessary thing—Child Welfare—is cut down lower than ever it was, but the vote for Min ister's salaries is doubled and the vote for members who come to sit here in the afternoons is increased over 500 per cent.

HON. THE PRIME. MINISTER:—What page is the Child Welfare vote on?

MR. FOX:—Page 61. The vote for Child Welfare for 1919 is $1920 and for 1920-21 the vote is $750. It is cut down by more than one-half.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—

The situation of the Child Welfare matter as I know it, is this: When I was Colonial Secretry of the National Administration in the autumn of 1916 I was approached by certain people on behalf of the Child Welfare Movement. The grant then was $450 and it was hoped that the vote would be increased in the Estimates. Although I am not holding anyone to blame for it it was overlooked by the subsequent administration and not put in the Es timates for 1919-20, but that $450 on recommendation to the Executive Gov erment by the Child Welfare Committee, after we took charge in November last, was increased to $750. Just

what this $1920 is for in the Estimates I do not know.

MR. MOORE:—Evidently that is the amount paid last year.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Evidently there is a mix-up in the figures. There is no amount in the Estimates to correspond with the $750 voted last year. In the autumn of 1916 an arrangement was made when I was Colonial Secretary under which $450 would be given and to go with a sum of money to be given by the Muni cipal Council and which amount was given to the ladies of the Newfound- Patriotic Association to provide for community nurses. That $450 was to be in the Estimates the following granted and paid. It was supposed ed that there be an increase in the year, but it was not. When we came back in November last, one of the first things I did as Colonial Secretary was to make enquiries regarding this vote, and I found that it had been overlooked. The late Government were not to blame. It was one of those things that went down as a Minute of Council, and when the Estimates were made up in the Spring of 1919 the vote was not included. The position laid before me in November was that the Child Welfare people had got the first $450; they did not get the second, and they then ask ed that there be an ncrease in the vote owing to the omission. We gave them the $450 short and increased the vote to $750, paid $750 on last year's account and voted $750 on this year's account. Just what this $1920 repres ents I do not know, but I will find out.

MR. FOX:—There is another point I am sorry to see the Estimates do not cover, and that is the additional coast al protection. Now surely this Government recognizes the necessity for added protection around our South and South-East Coasts. Surely they have had sufficient experience of the dangers that overtake the mariners coming to that coast and particularly passing St. Shott's. What is going to be done to place ships making Cape Race in an assured position that there is some chance when nearing that coast. Is the Government content and do they glory in the fact to have this part of our coast named the Grave Yard of the Atlantic. If any portion of the additional two million dollars was appropriated to an efficient protection service or wireless service or buoys, I would take no exception to it. But that is altogether omitted from the Estimates. To a cer ain extent unnecessary matters have received attention, while those of vital importance are absolutely treated with silent contempt. Now to the question of State Insurance. The Hon. Minister of Marine & Fisheries brought down a bill here, one of the objects of which was a provision in it that out of the amount collected under it the nucleus of it would be appropriated to State Insurance. Why not have a provision of that kind in the Estimates and bring down a bill and get this State Insurance scheme on the same basis here as it is in Eng land and get into shape. This matter which embodies the very best of political and economical principles has been neglected by the Government by not carrying into effect the principle displayed to the House by the Minister of Marine & Fisheries. This ought to be carried out. Another point I wish to refer to, and that is that no provision has been made for the erection of Outport Hospitals. We know that the General Hospital here in St. John's has been used to a certain extent for political purposes. The Hos pital is always over-flowed and the very efficient staff there cannot carry out their duties as effectively as might be if the proper assistance was given. We know of cases that require

medical or surgical treatment but their attention is overlooked because when they petition for entrance they find that the Hospital is over-crowded Hospitals ought to be erected in the principal Outports to relieve the congestion that always is evident at the General Hospital here. Why not erect hospitals around the principal dis tricts and have provision made for their maintenance in the Estimates? These hospitals would not alone assist the administration of the General Hos pital here but would be the means of saving a great many lives, because I know for a fact that lives have been lost for the necessary medical or surgical attention could not be obtained. I think the Government has been very neglectful in not providing Newfoundland with adequate Hospital service. The idea has been ventilated in the newspapers for the last ten years and on which there have been lectures and lenghty articles, and the only thing we find done is that the vote for the Harbor Grace Hospital has been reduced. Why does not the Government take under its benign care greater hospital protection? Surely they must recognize the necessity. If they have not it is high time they do, and if the two million dollars increase in the Estimates somewhat covered the matter I would be in a position to congratulate the Government on that score. Has any portion of the two million gone to the assistance of what is known as the "saddest place in Newfoundland"—the Poor Asylum? That is a regrettable feature that we have to call it the "saddest place in Newfoundland." Our present Poor Asylum is a disgrace to the Government. It is overflowing with inmates and it is not conducted as it should be owing to the lack of facilities and assistance. The place ought to be destroyed, in my opinion, and a suitable establishment provided for and maintained in an excellent manner. Why you cannot enter the doors there because one is stuffed by the odor and you are ashamed that you belong to Newfoundland when you approach this pitiable institution. It is a pitiable spectacle and it reflects discredit on Newfoundland. And now we come to one of the main things the Government talked about last Fall, and thatis the Railway Policy. There has been no vote brought down to deal with this Railway Policy. The Governmnt has not presented a Bill to cover the matter. Apparently they do not regard it necessary. We heard a tremendous lot last Fall about the Reid Octupus, and were told that they had their hands around the throats of the people of Newfoundland, and were told that the then administration connived with the Reids to raise the freight rates and allowed them to get away with the people's money and the Opposition then said the Reids were so and so. And now we find this Government allowing the same thing to be done. The Reids have raised freight rates and the fright on molasses and other commodities has been raised. Has not any attempt been made to curtail these rates? The only thing the Government has done is raised the petulant cry when they were the Opposition, but that even has failed. The Road is not in a fit condition at all to ride over. Only last year when the Assistant Clerk here and myself were travelling over the road when the train left the track and he was nearly finished when he was nearly incarcerated in the top bunk. It would be very regrettable if he had met an untimely end, altho he would have made my election in the East End of St. John's much easier. I am surprised that he has not urged the Government to remedy these suicidal conditions on the Railroad. The railway demands immediate attention. People take their lives in their hands on boarding the

train at the station. And no vote has been made for the remedy of the Rail road altho we were told how the Reids last fall were bleeding Newfoundland. When the railway was constructed the traffic was small and the same railroad exists to-day. To-day it is not efficient enough to cope with the demands made upon it. The rails and the rolling stock and the other necessaries are only a by-word. The tourist traffic of Newfoundland has been killed because the people abroad are not going to endanger their lives on stepping aboard the train at Port-aux-Basques. The Government should be alive to their task and bring down a measure and give effect to the proper propositions. Do not get two thousand dollars but get the real money and bring down the railway policy you were talking aboot and convince the people how necessary it is. The railroad does not pay and never did pay. I know friends who will not even leave for Topsail on the train without first taking out an accident policy, and as they say good by to you tears are in their eyes because they think there is a possibility that they will never return. Now what about the Education Bill. There are votes in the Estimates dealing with education, but in my opinion they will never be used. There has been no educa-

Bill brought down. What does it mean? Does the Government intend to bring a Bill down? If it does not why give this vote, and if it does why it should have been brought down sooner than this. We have heard a lot about this efficient education system. Why not bring down whatever is your policy? Very little attention has been paid this matter and I think very little attention will be paid. Is the Government nervous or is it afraid of the public censure, or does it think that it will be impossible to carry out the proposed educational scheme? I had not the advantage of hearing the Finance Minister explain the Estimates when he was tabling them, but so far as I am aware no explanation has been given. After all it is incumbent upon the members of this House to scrupulously go over every item of the Estimates and if I were an auditor to-morrow I would have to go through these items very carefully and see that they were correct before I could certify that were so. But I am not in a position to do that and I should be placed in that position. The Minister should provide us with sufficient information so that we could intelligently discuss the Estimates. We are in this position that we are not allowed to make correction and dare not take the Estimates under review. Some votes are incrased and some votes are decreased. Why? In the name of the world who can certify this accounting when no reason is given for them? We ought to have the necessary information.

HON. THE MIN. OF FINANCE:—I do not know whether you were here or not when I said that it is not necessary that we give the requisite information. Any particular information will be given when we come to the particular votes.

MR. HIGGINS:—That may be an answer to that but it is not an answgr to the position taken by the Opposition, and while I quite understand the position of the Minister of Finance in presenting the first set of Estimates, the position taken by the Minister of Justice in defending this new method of procedure by holding it is similar to the procedure adopted in Canada is not an answer to our remark that no change should be made in what has been the custom here.. We should be in a position to discuss them intelligently, and any principle different to that is not in accord with what has been the custom here for the yaars gone by. The Minister of Justice has

attempted to set up this new principle but we do not agree with it.Some of the increases have been granted on the report of the Commission appointed by the late Govrnment.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS:—The explanation given yesterday was all that could be given. I stated then that it was impossible for me or any member of the present Gov ernment to give an explanation of last year's Estimates. Last year a number of men in the Customs Department were paid out of contingencies, but this year no Customs men will be paid of contingencies. We are unable to give an explanation as to why certain things were paid out of the Customs and others out of the funds of some other department. For instance, a boat was hired by the Customs Department and was paid out of the Marine and Fisheries Department last year; this amount was $58,000.00. I explained then that I would explain any changes made in my department.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Chairman, as to the Finance Minister's statement that certain votes were contained in the Estimates which were previously paid out of contingencies before we could support these Estimates we ought to know about all these matters If these matters were explained with respect to some votes it may change our attitude toward other votes.

MR. MacDONNELL:—Are we to infer, Mr. Chairman, that the other Ministers didn't think it worth their while to tell the Minister of Finance on what grounds they based their increases. I notice that there is no mention of telephone extension in these Estimates. I remember last fall that one of the grand things that we were going to do was to extend the telephone system.

HON. MIN. MARINE & FISHERIES:—I think if you will look in the Estimates you will find that $35,000 has been voted for telephone extension.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—I may say that there is a special vote for the current year only for telephone exten sion it will not be included in the continuous annual votes. In reference to roads there is a general increase of 20 per cent. on them and your district is receiving special consideration.

MR. MacDONNELL:—Another matter, Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to and this is the petitions for various public works and improvements, and I don't think that it is usual to wait such a long time and find that nothing has been done. I myself presented a petition which was signed by every member in Somerset for a ferry across to Curling. The peculiar position in which these people are placed in is that there is at present two high schools in Curling and neither one at Somerset. There's no ferry and there's no chance for the kids to get to school. We are asked for the sum of $1200 for the annual upkeep. I think that here has been great lack of consideration. I intend to bring up this matter again when we come to the matter of roads and bridges. To the people who live on this side of the country and who are being well looked after in the past it does not strike home to them the serious situation in which we up there have been placed. I don't know how far these Estimates have played in the bye-election at Bay de Verde.

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 leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion this report was received and adopted and it was ordered that

the Committee have leave to sit again on tomorrow.

The remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled the following Reports of Public Schools under Roman Catholic Boards, Dec. 31, 1919; Public Schools under Church of England Boards, June 30, 1919.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

MONDAY, June 28th, 1920.

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

HON. MR. FOOTE:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Burin against any modification of the Prohibition Act.

MR. MacDONNELL.—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition for the people of Wood's Island and all the merchants of Bay of Islands for a public wharf at Wood's Island. There is not at the present time, and there never has been, a public wharf at that place. This is the reason why Wood's Island has never been a point of call for the coastal boats. This petition is signed by all the merchants at Bay of Islands and asks for an amount of $4,000 for the purpose of building this wharf. In the winter time this harbor is practically a free port, and it is the centre of herring shipping for the district. It is very dangerous to have to bring the herring out in dories. It is a safe harbor, and the water is deep. I give this petition my fullest support, and ask that it be referred as soon as possible to the department to which it relates so that if anything is going to be done this year there will be ample time in which to do it.

HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—I ask leave to present a petition from the people of Springdale for a public building, such building to contain the post office, the telegraph office, and other public facilities. Springdale is a growing place, and I give this petition my hearty support.

MR. SAMSON:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to support that petition.

MR. WINSOR:—Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of St. Brendan's asking that that place be made a port of call for the coastal boat. At the present time people going to the French Shore or other places north have to take an open boat and go considerable distance to the nearest port of call.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Justice if the Commission promised some time ago to look into the matter of the Woodford affidavit is yet appointed, and if so, the personnel of the Commission. It is now almost three months ago since this Commission was first promised, and I want to notify the Hon. Minister that we do not intend that this thing should drop.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition I would say that the Commission has been signed. The Hon. J. D. Ryan, President of the Legislative Council, is chairman of the Commission. The other members of the Commission are: Hon. R. K. Bishop and Mr. R. G. Rendell. Mr. Bishop, I understand, has had to go away, but any two members of the Commission have power to sit in the absence of the third. Mr. Summers, Deputy Minister of Justice, is to act as secretary of the Commission. The

Commission told me that they were anxious to sit right away, and they wanted to get permission to hold the sitting in one of the rooms of the Court House. They will sit in the tower room.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—I would like to ask the Hon. Minister if he will table a copy of the Commission, and if the hearing will be open to the public.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Speaker, I intended asking the Hon. Minister if the hearing will be open to the public, and a second point, whether the parties have the right to be represented by counsel.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Speaker, the hearing will be open to the public, and the parties will have the right to be represented by counsel.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Speaker, in asking leave to introduce this bill—a Bill to extend the life of the present Municipal Council for a period of six months—I would say that it seems that no statement of the expenses of the Municipal Council of last year was laid before the House, and it is doubtful whether it is legal to collect revenue under the circumstances. In order to remove any doubt I have put in a section making it legal. There is also a section extending the life of the present Municipal Council as Commissioners for a period of six months. In order to facilitate matters, and it is now the 28th of June, I would move, Mr. Speaker, that the rules of debate be suspended with regard to this Bill.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Speaker, I rise to second the motion with respect to the suspension of the rules, because I recognize that it is not the fault of the Government that this condition has arisen. It is obviously impossible to have an election in July.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the appointment of a temporary Commission for the City of St. John's and for other purposes" was introduced and read a first time and as the Rules of the House were on motion suspended it was ordered to be read a second time presently.

Whereupon on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the appointment of a temporary Commission for the City of St. John's and for other purposes" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon the House resolved itself into a committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the appointment of a temporary Commission for the City of St. John's and for other purposes."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs 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.

This report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the said Bill be read a third time presently.

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the appointment of a temporary Commission for the City of St. John's and for other purposes" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed being entitled as above, and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself in-

to a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

MR. MacDONNELL:—There is a matter I would like to know from the Marine & Fisheries Minister and that is if it true that the Edmund Donald went down to the Labrador with 300 passengers and only six boats and no wireless accomodation on board, and if the delay in holding her up was not to have her put in proper order.

HON. MIN. MARINE & FISHERIES --In reply I might say that Lloyd's Surveyor had charge of the fitting up of the ship and had orders to carry as many passengers as possible. I don't know how many passengrs went down on her.

MR. MacDONNELL:—We were told here the other day she was held up to be put in proper repair and now the Minister says that he does not know how many passengers she carried, and he doesn't say whether she had six or sixteen lifeboats.

MR. FOX:—Following the reply of the Hon. Minister of Justice that the Committee of Council is now negotiating with the Reid Nfld. Co. I wonder why the Government tolerates the references that are now made against that Company by the Government organs. I think there is a deliberate attempt being made to camouflage the issue. I think it is absolutely indecent to have this country flooded with abuse of the Reid Nfld. Co. If negotiations are now going on I think it is better for the Govrnment to muzzle its scoundrelly press. In reference to the Edmund Donald I think I can tell where she was sent. She was held over to go down to Bay-de-Verde for election purposes. The answer given by the Hon. Minister of Marine & Fisheries is very inhumane despite all the talk that has been going on in this House for the safeguard of ships and their human freights. Today the Hon Minister is not able to assure this House that the laws made are not being carried out. You leave the whole thing to Lloyd's Surveyor. I take it that that's another way you have of evading the issue. It is a very serious position and one which we can't wink out of sight. It is just as well for us to close up this House and put no laws on the Statute Book if the officials have no first-hand knowledge as to whether the laws that are made are being carried out.

HON. MIN. MARINE & FISHERIES —In reply I have to say that you don't expect me to be on board every ship when she is sailing to see whether she has any boats on board. It is the duty of the Lloyd's Surveyor to attend to that. I have no report yet from the Surveyor in relation to the Edmund Donald. The date of the vessel leaving has nothing to do with me. That's controlled by the Shipping Department. All my department has to attend to is the matter of boats. If the question is made here I would easily find out and make a reply.

MR. FOX:—And then you would be after locking the stable door when the horse had been stolen.

MR. HIGGINS:—Such consequences I think should be investigated and I think we should have the fasts. We have heard by way of criticism that the local government has fallen down as better was expected to be done. The whole truth is that you were all so busy in getting back Cave that you forgot everything else. If that be so and the ship has gone out in the condition I think the matter should be investigated.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Just a word before passing that vote. There is no necessity to have to vote this amount, having asked for information and received none. The total amount borrowed from the Old Country is 18 or 20 millions. I would like to know

the amount of exchange saved by the Colony on the 30th of December last and the 30th of June this year. What is the amount of exchange the Colony had to pay on the two loans that are payable in New York if so desired?

We borrowed from the Old Country about eighteen or twenty million dol lars, and I would like to know what was saved on the interest paid up to December 30th last, and June of this year, and also what amount of exchange we had to pay on the two loans in New York, payable at the end of every six months. I would like for this vote to stand over until we get this information, and then the House will readily see that there is no necessity for a vote of one hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars in this direction. I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Finance to the Public Debt statement, where there is a vote of $1,500,000.00 for Telephones. It is not intended to raise this amount and it should be stricken out. Also there is another amount to be raised of $135,000.00 at 4 per cent. Every schoolboy knows that you cannot raise money now at 4 per cent. It is up in the sixes and sevens. That amount should be strick en out also. I would ask that this information with regard to the difference on exchange between the Old Country, and th New, and between here and New York, be tabled tomorrow.

With regard to the Edmund Donald I was on the boat several mornings and evenings. I saw the Edmund Donald at the dock Saturday, and as the Hon. Minister of Justice knows I brought the matter up here, and I said that she was being held over for the election in Bay-de-Verde, and the Minister of Justice denied that fact. The hon. member for Hr. Grace, Mr. Archibald, took a large part in that discussion. He said that he was at the dock looking after the interests of his constituents in that direction, and that the boat was not ready to go; that if she were ready he would not stand for her being held over, that berths were being put in her. Now there is a charge that that boat left here with six life-boats that would hold ten or twelve people each, and she had no wireless, and about three hundred passengers on board, and that there was no doctor on board, I was told that thre was a man going on that boat in the capacity of doctor and he could neither read nor write, and that the only qualification he had was that he was a strong supporter of Mr. Coaker, and because of that he was going as Doctor. The farcical part of this is that these are the men who promised so much to the country, and the Government that pointed out what they would do for the Fishermen; and now the hon. the Minister of Marine & Fisheries stands up and cooly states that he did not know how many boats that ship had, and that unless complaint was lodged it was none of his business. When Mr. Piccott was in that position he used to supervise that end of the work himself. No boatever left here for the Labrador without his knowing all about her condition in this respect. Mr. Coaker says that it was the duty of Lloyd's Surveyor to attend to this, but I guess we would find if we asked that gentleman that he knows nothing about it either. What are you doing Mr. Coaker? You areneglecting your duty. That boat left here with three hundred passengers and with boats to hold one hundred in case of accident, without a doctor or wireless and if an accident was to happen the responsibility is yours, as you have done nothing to cope with such a con tingency. I do not know of anything worse since the boats have been going to the Labrador. If that boat reaches there in safety, it is only thru

the mercy of God. We are told that the fisherman has come into his own, but if that is his own then it is not worth much. I am not familiar with the fishermen of th North, but if they will stand for this they will stand for anything. Mr. Archibald said that he was carefully watching preparations on that boat. Aftr that I had business there, and he never came near her except that once to justify his statement that she was held up a couple of days, but according to reports she should have been held up longer, as there was no accomodation for three hundred people on board. Then when we come here and ask the Minister of Marine & Fisheries for an explanation, he says that it was not his business, that it was the business of Lloyd's Surveyor to see to these things. The only thing the representatives of the fishermen have done is to raise our salaries, and their own salaries, from one to five thousand dol lars. Is that the treatment for the under-dogs? If there is anything more farcical than that I would like to know it.

Now as far as the Budget is concerned we will not refer to that until Friday. We were prom ised great things, the readjustment of th Tariff, the reduction of taxation on a liberal basis in the futur.e It is not out of place for me to point out that there has been nothing done in that direction. There is not oneiota in that Budget Speech in the interests of the fishermen. A half dozen items are put on the free list, Bologna sausage is one. When we come to this on Friday we will have something to say. Now I do not wish to delay the business of the House, but I have asked the Minister for information with regard to difference on exchange on the debt in London and the debt in New York, and I ask him to defer this vote until an explanation can be given.

MR. BENNETT:—Mr. Chairman, Since Friday last I have had an opportunity of glancing through the Estimates. I pointed out on that occasion that members on this side of the House were very much disappointed, and especially those who were in the Executive of the late Government, upon the lines in which decreases and increases were made and were not made according to the recommendations of the Civil Service Commission. Increases were made in the several Departments to the salaries of Ministers, Deputy Ministers, Chief Clerks, and so on; but very little attention was given to the merits of the class of people who are most in need of some consideration and need some further increases at present to their inadequate salaries. I endeavored to point out that a great lack of judgment was displayed in regard to the increases made in the different positions of the different departments, and I am more than ever convinced that the Government have not given sufficient attention to those who have important duties to perform in the Civil Service, and who are usually treated to some consideration, but the Deputy Ministers of all the different departments have been given very substantial increases, increases out of all proportion. It will be also observed in the Estimates that great favor was shown by the Government in the matter of increases. In some instances increases may have been justified, bu tthere are others in the giving of which, I think, gross extravagance has been perpetrated. I pointed out the other day that there were certain officials who worked 10 and 12 hours every day who had their salaries ignored, and in some cases, reduced; while other officials who did not work half that time daily got substantial increases. When the Civil Service Commission were appointed

their instructions were to make recommendations according to merit, the amount of work performed and the responsibilities of office. I have not a copy of the report of the Commissioners nor have I seen a copy, but I can see by the Estimates now that that principle has not been followed, and I fear that instead of having an efficient public service that the different departments will lapse into a state of indifference owing to the fact that no reward and no recognition is given to those indispensible public officials that I have referred to. A great many men who have important duties of office to perform did not get any increases for the reason that they were found guilty of bearing kindly feelings towards members of the late Government. Some of this class of man were not alone refused consideration, but were dismissed. The political axe was used on men who have spent years of their life in the public service; men who were efficient, competent and in every way able to perform their duties, have been shamefully thrown upon the street and told that their services are no longer required. I have no knowledge and no recollection of any such conduct before. It is a new departure and one that is bound to re-act.

SIR. M. P. CASHIN:—We were told the other day that the Estimates were our making and we were also told by the Finance Minister that we would get an explanation of all the votes as they went along in Committee. Now I would like to ask what amount was saved on the interest of the loans.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE:—I will have the information in the morning.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Until we get this information, I would ask that this vote under Public Debt stand over.

MR. BENNETT:—I would like to know if the Banks here are holders of coupon premiums at the increased rate of exchange.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE:—Yes, but I am not certain if the Bank of Montreal is. However, I will find out.

MR. BENNETT:—Are the Banks cashing the premiums at par? The reason why I ask that question is that some individual holders were refused at some of the Banks. Perhaps that is unknown to the oGvernment.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—As far as I can learn it is common knowledge that people have been refused the dif ference in exchange on premiums at the Bank of Montreal and were offered only face value for them, but thay went across the street and got the exchange at the Royal Bank of Canada. It is awkward if the Government has issued an order to the Bank of Montreal not to pay it, and places that institution in a false position. The Finance Minister admits now that the Bank of Montreal were not cashing the premiums and still he says to the Committee that he will get the information to-morrow.

MR. BENNETT:—This cuts both sides. Here the civil service is filled with political supporters as a reward for services rendered during the elections and the present Government is certainly following in the footsteps of its predecessors in that direction, and I have no fault to find and I think it justifiable to expect that when vacancies occur they will be filled by those who supported the Government during the campaign and it is only natural in the course of events to find these people getting the sympathy of the Government and obtaining from it the fulfilment of their wishes when the recipients have benefitted the Government by their being over-zealous during the contest. They may have displayed some particular discretion or ardor and so afterwards their reward comes along.

But it is regrettable that those whom they replace are thrown into the street, maybe without the merest enquiry.

But this kind of procedure is cruel and occurred in the past in Newfound land when many years ago cruel acts were perpetrated against old officials because they were identified with a certain party and history shows that those who are guilty of such acts will receive the sametreatment when the time comes. I can appreciate the dif ficulties of the new Administration in satisfying all those who are clamoring for office, and some times it is essential that some individuals will be put out of their offices for the pur pose of putting a friend or rfiends in their places. But there is very little justification unless the dismissed one is guilty of some outrageous conduct Such dismissals might mean in some cases starvation to himself and family. Some other man less worthy and on whom no one is dependent may be put in his place. No Government should adopt this but start in to remedy the condition of affairs that have existed. The increases to the Ministers of the different departments is justifiable under certain conditions but I submit Mr. Chairman that that is not so at this juncture. The position of the Prime Minister which is the first in the list under Civil Government is one that heretofore was performed without pay or emolument. Sir Robert Bond occupied the dual position of Prime Minister and Colonial Secretary but only accepted the salary voted the Colonial Secretary, namely, two thousand dollars. It is true he was a man of means. Sir Edward Morris did the same thing when he accepted the Prime Ministership without pay and I was one of those at the time in his Government who advised him that he should receive some consideration for the work performed because I think the principle is sound that this country should not expect from the Prime Minister services without compensation. If the Government of the day find themselves in a position of affluence, in a position that the future looks rosy, that there is a surplus revenue, then by all means pay the Ministers as high as we can afford. But it has gone through this country and it is having a detrimental effect on the people of the country and it will create unrest when the people properly appreciate the fact that the Ministers of the Crown have raised their own salaries one hundred per cent. It is true some of the duties of the Ministers are onerous and they should be paid accordingly. It is also true that some of the Ministers perform their work in every possible detail and it is also true that some of them do not do so but leave it to the hands of their deputies or chief clerks and merely take it easy by passing the time in having interviews and such like. Why should the Prime Minister be in the dual position of filling the two most important positions in the Government? He cannot perform the duties of both at one and the same time. The duties of Prime Minister are not administrative the same as those of the Colonial Secretary. There is no reason why there should be a Prime Minister's Department at all. Sir Robert Bond performed all the functions of the Government outside presiding over the Executive Board and as Leader of the House through the Colonial Secretary's Department. Therefore through that Department all the work is practically transacted and the Minister is generally kept busy. Therefore it seems excessive that the Prime Minister should draw two large salaries. As I pointed out before he is taking a very nice slice of the grants voted by the Government for individuals. The Prime Minister is not considered a man of large means still he

has large opportunities ahead of him and we are told by the Minister of Justice that he has been retained on the Labrador Boundry dispute and will accompany the Minister of Justice to the other side and he will no doubt get a handsome fee out of the job. I know from past experience and I have often regretted that I am not a lawyer myself. Many a lawyer has profited from the Government on account of this old historic dispute. This is one of the things lawyers are always looking for. The French shore question gave an opportunity to some lawyers to get large fees for services rendered and since that has been settled we have had no other except this Labrador Boundary question. I am glad the Minister of Justice is not too late to get a little crumb and no doubt he will and if he wins the case he will deserve the thanks of the whole Dominion. The Minister of Finance has provided for large fees in this matter. With such an able counsel we do not anticipate failure. If Mr. Warren does not win the case he will still have the pay coming to him. It makes no difference to lawyers. But I believe our case will be favourable. I know a little about it because Mr. Furlong prepared the case and I think he arranged the issue and I think our case a strong one. It will be a great thing to have it settled to our satisfaction and it will mean great big developments on that coast because I think it is a matter of history that the development of the Newfoundland-Labrador Coast beyond doubt opens up great possibilities. The Labrador areas contain a product that the world is starving for, and if our claims are upheld it is quite possible that it will be second in value only to our cod fishery. I know Mr. Monroe, Mr. Tobin and others who have areas down there, and they are negotiating with a company that is ready to develop the areas as soon as our claim is established. If the claim is settled satisfactorily it will not be much trouble for the Minister of Finance and Customs to raise a loan to run the country. I hope that the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice will be successful. In this connection I would like again to refer to the salaries of the Prime Minister and Colonial Secretary. While Mr. Squires may not be a man of great means as was Sir Robert Bond, he is getting $8000 as Minister of the two departments, which with his sessional pay, emoluments from the Militia Department, and big retainers' fees will make him in a little while a man of considerable and independent means.

Reference was made this afternoon by the Minister of Finance to the winding up of the Militia Department. We have no information as to what this Department is costing the country. We have the Estimates here that show a very large expenditure, and why that expenditure is going on I am at a loss to know. The London Office has been wound up for a year or nine months. The whole thing now amounts to the payment of pensions. Now, in connection with that matter of pensions the Prime Minister stated that the $4000 put down for a commissioner was intended to be $2000 for each of two Commissioners. I think he is wrongly informed. Major Dr. Parsons is getting $4000, and I think we are getting the Doctor's services very cheaply. It would be impossible to build a man better fitted for the work than is Dr. Parsons. The other Commissioner, Mr. Clift, is paid $2400. I don't know if it is the intention of the Governmnt to fill the place vacated by Sir P. T. McGrath. Personally I think the work could well be left in the hands of the two gentlemen that remain. The work of the future will not be anything like it was in the past. Once the pensions have been adjusted

they will go along without any change The work can be handled by a very ited board, and I feel quite sure that it could well be left to Dr. Parsons and Mr. Clift. A question was asked on the floors of this House Saturday regarding the Vocational Committee. I understand that the Committee has resigned. When I was in that Department there was the utmost confidence in the Vocational Committee. The work of the Civil Re-Establishment Committee is one that has greatly benefitted the country, and I am very sorry to hear that the Committee has resigned. I know their work. I know one of the returned men was well placed in civil life.

Before the formation of the Militia Department the whole lot of the work was looked after by Major Howley. Major Howley has proved himself to be a most invaluable man, and if there is anything to be done, if there is any reward to be given in a monetary way, or a civil service position I hope that Major Howley will get it. I hope therefore, that when the time comes he will be properly rewarded..

When the House rose for recess I was referring to certain officers in the Militia Department, and I was endeavoring to point out certain claims they had on the Government and I would now like to refer to the Estimates in reference to the Pensions. You will rmember that when the Estimates were tabled the only votes that showed a decrease was that of the soldiers' and sailors'. A great many lives were lost in the great war and the people who were responsible for the devoting of pensions when this means was first introduced were quite satisfied that they should be well recompensed for the valiant services they gave to their King and Empire. The cutting down of the pension this year is not the matter of cutting down any particular pension, but it is owing to the changed condition as when this measure was first introduced. The Imperial part of the Royal Navy shows an increase of $5000 and I take it that this is being reimbursed by the British authorities. The main item was the matter of pensions to soldiers and sailors and this matter created a great deal of discussion. The Great War Veterans' Association took certain steps and made certain represntations to the Government, and I hope these representations will bring full amounts to these worthy subjects of His Gracious Majesty the King. Nothing could be too great for them. The G.W.V.A. time and again made representation to the Government and advocated the organization of the Militia and Pensions Department on Canadian lines and to have pensions paid at Canadian rates. They met the Executive Government and the whole matter was thrashed out and Sir M: P. Cashin, the then Prime Minister, told them that they would get every consideration.

From the day I went to the Department I devoted my whole time to the work there, and I pointed out the other evening I organized the department, owing to the fact that as Colonial Secretary I probably had a better knowledge of conditions than any other Minister of the Crown, and at the request of Sir E. P. Morris, I took over that department. It must be borne in mind that we had never had any previous experience in that line, or previous knowledge of the running of such a department, and instead of getting support and sympathy everything passible was done by my opponents to make it difficult for me and to poison the minds of the soldiers and sailors against me, whom it was my duty to look after. I appreciate the fact that it was political tactics, but the Department should not have been dragged into politics. It was too sacred and serious a one to

be dragged into the hurly burly ot politics.The seriousness of the situation was open to me, and those who were associated with me, will bear me out that I did all in my power and gave my full attention to the work of the department. I went there early in the morning, and performed the duties there until late at night, and neglected my own affairs. I was blamed for the fact that the Blue Puttee boys who came home on furlough had to return to the other side. Well, I want to say that when I was in England in 1916 I went to France and I had a round robin from the Blue Puttee boys to see if it would be possible for them to get home on furlough. I said that I would do my best to have the request acceded to. I saw the Commander-in-Chief and pointed out to him the situation and said that if they were given leave that I would be responsible for their return in time to go in the lines. He said that they were very short of men, but as Newfoundland was such a small country and had done so much, and in view of the fact that they would not be going into action for over two months, he would have the necessary furlough granted to allow them to return home, provided that they came back in time.

I had to go to the War Office to get this performed, and I had to give a personal guarantee that the men would return. They told me that similar requests had come from Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and South Africa, but in every case the request was refused, as they could not spare the men. I returned with some of them, via New York, and as far as was in my power I did everything I could for the men. I think my friend, Mr. LeGrow, will bear me out, as he was one of them who came. For the whole voyage I never heard the men murmur, and I have heard no complaint since from the men who came then. I would have been very pleased if I could have recommended to His Excellency, who summoned me to Government House, to meet a delegation headed by the present Prime Minister, that their request be acceded to. I had to tell him that I had given a guarantee to the War Office that the men would return, and as much as I would like to have them remain, I had to keep faith with the authorities, and for the sake of the reputation of the Regiment and the country, I could not recommend any other consideration than that they return as agreed. It may have been possible for them to remain in England, but we had to keep faith with the War Office. I was charged with being callous and sending men back, who had already for a considerable time borne the brunt of the fight, but I could not do anything else. Now when the requests of the delegation which met the Government are considered, I hope that the Government will be as liberal as possible, not alone to them, but to the dependents of boys who went over, although strictly speaking they may not be entitled to any consideration. Before the late Government went out of power they were taking steps to recognise claims of those people. It must be appreciated that a young man who went over in 1914 has some claims, although at the time his father or mother may not be entirely dependent upon him for support. It must be borne in mind that in the course of four or five years the situation may change a lot. The father might not be able to work now as he was then. For years he had been looking forward to the day when he would no longer be able to bear the burden of expense, and he was counting on his son to take his place. Every member knows that

there are cases such as this, and with this in view, the late Government appointed a Committe to act in conjunction with the Pensions Board, when bona fide cases should come to their notice, and give some relief to those people. If the work of that Commission had been carried on many a deserving person today would not ask for relief in vain. I heard nothing of the work of that Commission since, but I would recommend the Government even at this late hour, to do something in this direction, because there is no better tribute we could pay to the memory of those who are gone than to see that those left behind get assistance when they need it. The G.W.V.A. is an organization which has influence, and it is not good for any Govt., no matter how long in office, no matter how strong it is, to turn down a request from them, without due consideration. It is not, Mr. Chairman, my intention to delay the Committee, and I hope it will be understood that my remarks are not made in a spirit of obstruction. I merely take this opportunity of making one or two observations in this connection, and I hope that they will bear fruit. I notice that outside of the regular increases referred to by several speakers on this side of the House, such as Ministers' salaries, Deputy Heads, Departmental Heads, etc., that there seems to be an epidemic in departments for the appointment of secretaries. The first is the Secretary to the Minister of Justice. Last year the amount paid this gentleman was three hundred and seventy-five dollars; this year it is twelve hundred dolars. There is also a clerk at ten hundred and twenty dollars. Might I ask the Minister of Justice if the secretary whose salary is raised from three hundred and seventy-five dollars to twelve hundred dollars, is the same individual as last year.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE.—I have already explained to the House that that secretary was an assistant to the Secretary in the Prime Ministers Department. His name is Mr. Godden. He was receiving twelve hundred dollars and I took him over to my department. I don't know where this three hundred and seventy five dollars came from.

MR. BENNETT:—I also notice that the Minister of Finance has a secretary at twelve hundred dollars. That is a new vote also.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS:—It is not exactly a new vote as a stenographer there last year was getting $800.00 from contingencies.

MR. BENNETT:—I see that the Secretary of Agriculture is advanced from twelve hundred and sixty dollars to twenty-five hundred dollars. That is Mr. Bailey, and it is a deserving case. He is an extremely competent official and has done great work, and he is not being paid too much. There is an increase from eighteen hundred dollars to five thousand dollars for the Director of Theological Surveys. Is that the position occupied by the late J. P. Howley?

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS:—Yes, it is.

MR. BENNETT:—Is there a new appointment?

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS:—No, but it is assumed that we will be able to secure a competent man for that position.

MR. BENNETT:—There is a secretary in the Marine and Fisheries Department at twelve hundred dollars. That is a new appointment, is it not?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—Yes, it is.

MR. BENNETT:—There is a vote here of five thousand dollars for Su-

perintendent of Fisheries. Is there such a man in existence?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—No, we cannot get such a man at present.

MR. BENNETT.—Now, I regret to find that there is no increase for Old Age Pensions. There is an increase of ten thousand dollars, but that was granted by the late Government last year.

HON. MIN. OF FINANCE & CUSTOMS:—I would like to point out that there is an additional increase of ten thousand dollars by the present Government. Eight thousand of that the Government derived from interest on certain bonds, which will be added to the two already shown.

MR. BENNETT:—I would suggest to the Minister the desirability of considering an increase in this respect. It must be borne in mind that fifty dollars today is practically unable to purchase any more than twenty-five was a few years ago, and it would be a gracious act to increase this vote to seventy-five dollars. That would help to make up in part for the other increases. With regard to Education, as I understand the Minister is bringing down a bill in this connection; when this comes down he may be in a position to give us some information on this matter, and we may have something further to say, for there is a grant for this department of twelve thousand dollars. With the Minister's salary, and other expenses, this will mean a vote of twenty-five thousand dollars. I notice as we go along that there is very little increase if any for the poor relief. That is understandable, as they are in the same position as the Old Age Pensioners. Also there has been no consideration given to Postal officials, couriers and ferry men. I hope that the Civil Service Commission, whether finished work or not, will find it convenient to recommend an increase in this direction. If the recommendations in this direction are too late for the Estimates, I have no doubt that if the Government grant increases on Executive responsibility that it will receive the endorsation of the House next year when the Estimates are laid on the table of the House.

Before taking my seat I would like to say a word in connection with the recent election in Bay de Verde. I was asked to go there to assist the Opposition Candidate, in company with Mr. Fox, and I would like to say here, that I never met a more hospitable people, or I was never more cordially received. I was really surprised to see the posperity there, and I am sure that Bay de Verde can be taken as an example of what a fishing district means in this country. During the campaign in Freshwater I told the people there nothing personal against the members of the present Government. I said that Mr. Cave was a man I had a personal regard for, and I thought he would be a worthy representative if he was in good company and the people had confidence in him. I thought that the point at issue was not altogether political. I pointed out that last fall, when Opposition candidates were contesting the different districts that they took advantage of the condition of affairs, and naturally placed on the shoulders of the Government the responsibility. I pointed out that in politics I had no fault to find with these tactics, I believe it had a great influence on the votes of the electorate, but I also pointed out that when they, the present Government, was elected to power, they should be held responsible for present conditions. Not alone have the commodities not decreased

since then but they have increased in prices. The question of Fish Regulations was one discussed freely, and, although I have been charged with inconsistency in this direction, I want to say tonight that when these Regulations were before the House, and when certain amendments were suggested from this side of the House and accepted, that I supported the Regulations to a certain extent, but not entirely. I concluded that we had done our best to improve them and let the matter go with these amendments added. The next day the 'Daily Advocate' came out with a statement that the Fish Regulations had passed unanimously with the exception of Sir John Crosbie. I think that the House will remember that when next we met I took opportunity to protest against that, that as far as I was concerned, they had not passed unanimously in their entirety.

I am in favor of the Regulations and I told the people of Bay de Verde I was, but there were other conditions to which I could not subscribe because they were not a benefit to the country. I told the people of Bay de Verde the question for them was whether they would endorse the Regulations or otherwise. They were immaterial to me personally, I told them; and I told them the responsibility was on them because their decision would be taken as an answer on behalf of the whole country as regards the best interests of the country in reference to the Regulations. The answer has come and by a considerable majority of the electors of Bay de Verde, and I wish to say that there are many sensible men there who do not see eye to eye with them in this respect. There are nine hundred sensible men in the district who have recorded their ballots as against fourteen hundred. I will not say they are not sensible men and will say that time will tell whether their decision is in the best interests of the district or not. However, the decision has come and I feel sure that the Government will realise the great confidence reposed in them by the electorate of Bay de Verde, and they will realise more fully the great responsibility they have in the administration of the marketing and the sale and inspecting of our staple industry. One of the papers supporting the Government attacked me because of my attitude in this connection. It said I was inconsistent, I was unworthy of the least respect and consideration of sensible people; still Western Bay was the only place we had any opposition at our meetings and that came from one man, and, although they were unsuccessful, still they may bear good fruit in the future. I do not wish to detain the Committee any longer. I will reiterate that I think the Government made a great mistake in making increases in the directions not required and neglecting those who should have had their first consideration. The poor underpaid official has been left out. The well-to-do-officials, the members of this House, the heads of the departments, and the gentlemen in the House of Lords, from the President down, have received the most liberal consideration at the hands of the Government. If the country can afford it all well, if the times were prosperous and the outlook hopeful, I could understand the Government's attitude but the outlook is not hopeful and the prices of our commodities are deplorably low in comparison with the prices of what we have to purchase. The Minister of Finance, this evening, made his Budget Speech of which we will have an opportunity of studying in the next

few days. And he expects to get a large revenue, and this can only be derived from the earning powers of the people, and if that earning power is cut down one half, if the returns for our products are diminished, to a large extent the people will not be able to buy in the same old way, and therefore the duty to be collected will not be as great as heretofore. We are passing through a new era and economy is necessary, and the cutting down of expenditure is essential for our financial safety, for the present time has never been equalled in the history of this country. Today a dollar cannot be put to good use; and, therefore, the Government of the day have no small proposition and no small responsibility in handling the affairs of finance of this country if things do not turn out a little better than the present indicates. I must say in reference to a matter that was before this House this afternoon, and that is the Newfoundland Railway; that it is not sufficient to meet the requirements of the people, and I must take this opportunity of saying that the railway is overworked especially during the five years of war, and it was practically driven to death in endeavoring to handle the traffic which was essential for our existence. It was the only means of transportation. In fact the railroad was run so that its life has been shortened because of its extra work during these anxious years. The Government was blamed for not taking over the control of the railroad to meet the necessities of the people. It is true every other country, Great Britain, United States and Canada, took over the control of the railroads. But the running of these roads under Government control meant serious financial loss to each of those countries. Canadian Government lost millions of dollars when it had the operation of the railroads under its control, but it was necessary for the transportation of her soldiers, foodstuffs and coal. What was true in Canada was also true in the United States. It is also true of Great Britain when she had to nationalize her railroads and run them under Government control because of the extraordinary conditions existing, and that country could not do otherwise. And if we in this country had taken the same course the same kind of service could not have been arranged here. The Government control has always been a failure and especially would that apply in a country like ours where we have no persons competent to superintend and manage them; and the best thing to be done was what other contractors do, and that is, take the best out of what we have until such time as when we get back to normal. The railroad was not built for the work it has done, and therefore its life has been shortened and we are in the position today that a large sum of money is required to put it into proper operation. That has got to be found but where it is is the problem. If the Reid Newfoundland Company is responsible they should be made find the money and put the road in proper shape. If they are not responsible then it is the duty of the Government. They will have to undertake the proper fixing up of the road and if necessary placing new rails from here to Port aux Basques and it requires re-equipped rolling stock which cannot be done without on the only highway in Newfoundland. They will further have to see that it is kept in order. The Commission appointed by the Government to settle the matter have a very important problem ahead of them and as the honorable member for St. George's described here today when

the trains arrive they are so overcrowded that that point alone is sufficient to cause serious consideration. Therefore I beg to say that outside of any particular items that might come up I have no further statements to make in reference to the Estimates. I think the members on this side of the House have no desire that the business should be delayed and I hope the worst days of the Session have passed and the rest will be gone through expeditiously.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Chairman, I said that when the people of Newfoundland endorsed the fish regulations that I would, but that I was not satisfied to take the say-so of ten or fifteen men. It has been said that we on this side of the House are not fishermen and do not know what we are talking about. The Government said these Fish Regulatinos are all right and we will put them through. I had my doubts on the subject and I said, I will bow to the will of the people, and I will try to get first-hand evidence if possible, and I went to Bayde-Verde and two of you gentlemen were there, and see if I do not repeat now what I said then. The people themselves had to try the issue, and I told them that if they said that they approved of the regulations I would accept the opinion of an experienced people, but if they did not, I could come back and face the Government and tell them that I was no longer a man of no experience, but that I represented one of the largest fishing constituencies, and they told me to come here and protest against these Regulations, but they said that the Fish Regulations are all right, and I accept their statement. But going back to the question of Prohibition. Something will have to be done, and soon. We cannot allow this law to go down as it now is through all the years which fcae Newfoundland. We have the Controller's Department shut at five o'clock, and other stores you can get into morning, noon and night, and get liquor on a script or without one, according as it suits the will of the proprietor. Why is not the Controller's Department as much at the service of the people as any other? The other day a strong supporter of mine came along to me and asked me if I had a script to give him. I opened my pocket-book and gave him the only one I had. Greater love no man hath than to give his last script to a friend; but the position taht faces Newfoundland, and St. John's particularly is this, that the ontroller's Department is not being thrown open to the people as it should be. Supposing I was sick tonight, and I am very likely to get sick, I usually get sick about this time, and I needed a stimulant, I could not get to the Controller's Department to get anything. Yhy should that be? If liquor is dispensed in this country because of medical necessity, why take the long chance that such a necessity will not arise after five in the evening? Either the Controller's Department is a dispensary for medical purposes, in which case it should be thrown open to the people morning, noon and night, or it is a legalized public house subject to certain rules and regulations set down by the Government; but the Government says it is a medical dispensary. I endorse everything that has been said with regard to Prohibition. I think the principle is quite correct. The Scripture says "If thy right eye offend thee pluck it out," but it does not tell us to pluck out our brother's eye, and that is what we are doing in this connection. So, therefore, I appeal to the Government to seriously consider the question of harkening to the appeal of the people of Newfoundland. "Art thou weary, art thou thirsty, art thou sore dis-

tressed?" They say, yea we are, and we have sent petitions to the House of Assembly. They have asked for bread and we have given them a stone, and we should have given them wine if they asked for water. Something should be done to rectify the state of affairs in Newfoundland today.

There is a vote for three thousand dollars for the Deputy Assessor's Department. I think there is one gentleman who should have a proper salary and that will not remunerate him for his services, and I think that Inspector O'Reilly should be properly compensated for his work. Not alone is it a delicate work he has to perform but you want a specialist for it and you have one in Inspector O'Reilly, a man who can unravel every business problem given him by an experienced business man, and he is not getting proper salary when he only gets three thousand dollars. We call him a Deputy Head, or a Departmental Head, and why is he not paid on a par with the other men occupying the same positions. If you look here you will find that the Assessors Department the Auditor General is getting twenty-two hundred dollars, when if he is a Deputy Head he should be getting thirty-six hundred dollars, and if he is a Departmental Head he should be getting four thousand dollars. How far has the Government looked into this? Has any notice been taken of it at all? It looks as if they are trying to hunt with the hounds and run with the hare. They did not take any notice of the recommendation by the Civil Service Commission that the Prime Minister's salary should not be more than six thousand dollars, and they have given him a lift of four thousnd more. Why the whole thing is a farce. The Government talks of millions when a couple of years ago it was thousands. They give thousands to Ministers of the Crown, and not one cent to the man who is doing all the work. That is not a square deal. That is the rankest kind of class legislation; we let other men do the work for us, but we partake of the benefits ourselves. Now, for example, take the Law Clerk in this House. He has more important work to do than every member on the Government side, and he is getting seven hundred and fifty dollars. If you sent a retainer to Harry Winter and asked him to draft one of the bills that go through the Clerk's hands he would charge you five hundred dollars and he would be entitled to, because he is bringing to bear on it a specialist's ideas, the trained knowledge of a trained mind, and he is giving you the benefit of long years of experience, and we expect a professional man who is losing twice that amount by being here at all, to draft our bills and be content himself with seven hundred and fifty dollars. Is that right? Is that any encouragement to him to exercise his best abilities? He is supposed to see that every act goes through right, and to perfect his work. He will do it because he is that kind of man, because he takes a price for his work, not because of the money. But you will not find men like him in every corner, and we are going on a wrong principle when we expect the maximum amount of work at a minimum figure, and unless we get rid of this idea we will never have things right in Newfoundland. Now take the Clerk's Assistant and he is rewarded with seven hundred and fifty dollars, and every day of his life in session and out he has to be in attendance here, to look after his duties. He is a man who not alone has expert knowledge, but a man who has shown that he is the most competent person in the country to perform this work, and he gets seven hundred and fifty dollars, and we expect these men to do their work

for that pittance. Now I want to speak of Mr. Carter, and I would not mention him only he is in a position where he will shortly need every dollar he can get. It is not playing the game to give that man five hundred dollars, when he went out last fall and fought for you and your party. That man if he attended to the duties of his profession would realize that he is losing money by being here, but he comes here to help you out. He went to St. John's East last year as a candidate for your party and that is the way you treat him. Now there is another official and that is the official Reporter of the Minutes. That is an arduous undertaking. I was there in that position myself and I was up until one and two in the morn ing, and at that time we had no prolonged sessions, and the salary is the same now as it was eight years ago and you expect that young lady to do that work for one hundred dollars. She has to do hard work and she earns four times that amount. Now we come to the Reporters in this House and see the way they have been treated. They have been coming here morning, noon and night, sitting in that box and doing the work of the House for the amount of two hundred and ten dollars. Their requests have not been considered. You did not do them the courtesy to say, Yes, we will give your request serious consideration, but instead of recognizing the just position that these men took that the laborer is worthy of his hire, the Govrnment says, you are getting as much as you will get, and if you do not like that you can get out, and we will have your places filled by others i can tell you that it requires experienced men to do this work, and it is not fair treatment for them. As my friend Mr . Walsh says, you leave them where you found them at the foot of the mountain brow. I do not know what happens in the Upper Chamber, but I do know that the gentleman who for years past has been holding the honorable position of the Usher of the Black Rod faces the ignominious position that his salary is cut by one-third. For what reason I do not know. It is not that he did not give satisfaction, because he did, and we have his salary of six hundred dollars cut down to four hundred dollars, and we hav the leader of the Government in that House, a position that gentleman strove after in the past because of the honor of holding it, receiving a salary for doing something that he should consider it an honor to do. We are commercializing every position of honor in the country; we are prostituting every public position, because we make it worth a man's while to take those positions; we are encouraging a man to take them for what he can get out of them, instead of what he brings to those positions, and we have gentlemen in the Upper House, the Lords of Newfoundland, being paid, and these are not necessitous men, they are men who from their positions in the community are looked upon as being above monetary needs, and it in a poor state of affairs when we have to pay these men to go there. It is deplorable to make those positions a question of dollars and cents. It is killing the spirit of honor, and it is killing the very soul of the country. That is what we are doing. We are holding out an inducement to a man to take positions like this because he knows it is a credit to him to hold such a position, but we are dangling before him the golden dollar, and we say to him, make it your God because it is the Golden Calf of Newfoundland today. The whole thing is wrong. It is wrong to put two million dollars extra taxation on the people. It is wrong for this reason. When the Hon. the Minister of Finance & Customs brought in his Estimates he

told us that 90 per cent of the increases were made by the late Government. That is not right, and even if it were true this Government should take care that it does not follow in the footsteps of the Government which it held up to ridicule last Fall for the same things. You are only trustees of the public money, and you commit a breach of trust when you do not carefully consider the benefit to be derived from every dollar you spend. The Min ster of Public Works has set himself upon a nedestal of rectitude. I will tell something in connection with this. A short time ago a matter of urgent necessity was brought to his attention for one of the districts and he said, build that bridge but it cannot cost more than thirty dollars. The bridge was built and for years will be a monument to him. When the cost was made up it came to thirty-one dollars, and when the bill was presented to him he said, Satan get behind me, You will not get thirty-one dollars you will only get thirty dollars.

I am glad, Mr. Samson, that you interrupted me, because it gives me a chance to recall to your mind the last time we met. You remember that you ridiculed a certain honourable member in this House, Sir John Crosbie, and that I had to rise to my feet and take you to task for it, and I said to you then, as I say now, that if your leader, the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, had been there that he would have been the first to criticise you for criticising Sir John Crosbie, as you had no right whatever to do it in his absence, and when you said he was big and bombastic. I said he was not a couple of years ago when his assistance was sought for the protection of your union. Ask your leader if Sir John Crosbie's advice and opinion is not always received by him with pleasure, and if he has not sought it often.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—I never sought his advice.

MR. FOX:—We all know that you did, and it is a credit to you; but the point I make, sir, is this, that the gentlemen who retorted to me, had no right to make that reference to Sir John Crosbie.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—You had no right to make the reference now that you did make.

MR. FOX:—He had no right to comment upon a man in his absence. And now, Mr. LeGrow, I want to ask you a question. It has been brought to my notice that you said that the Opposition had to send down to the support of Mr. Puddister, in Bay de Verde, the scum of St. John's Is that correct?

MR. LeGROW:—I did not say that.

MR. FOX:—Now, Mr. Scammell, I am going to outline a position, and make you the arbitrator. I was accused of calling those two hon. and gallant gentlemen, Lieut. Small and Sergt.-Major LeGrow, a mass of hypocrisy. I assure the hon. gentlemen of this House that I did not say so; that I was referring to the hypocritical attitude of the Government in connection with the Woman's Suffrage Bill, and now if you say that I did, I will apologise for saying so. When I was going through Western Bay the first report that reached me was that Cave did not want any speaking on nomination day.

SERGT.-MAJOR LeGROW:—Cave and Puddister got together and decided that there would be no speaking.

MR. FOX:—When this report reached me I consulted with Mr. Puddister and we decided that if Mr. Cave did not want any speaking on nom-

ination day that we would not have any either, and we packed our grips and went home. The reason I went there was to find out the kind of people from whom Sergt-Major LeGrow sprung, to find out the kind of people that produced a man that was ready to sacrifice everything for his country; and I came back satisfied that he was not alone a good representative of the people, but of a good people, and when we came back we were informed that certain gentlemen had spoken. Just before nomination I met you, and I said. LeGrow, I was accused of insulting you; and when we get to St. John's I am going to refer this to Mr. Scammell. I have had no communication with him ever before on the subject and I will ask for his verdict. If he says that I did insult a personal friend of mine, a man whose friendship I desire to keep, I will apologise to you before the House, and now I ask him for his opinion.

MR. SCAMMEL:—Mr. Chairman, the position that I take is this. The hon. gentleman cannot deny, will not deny, that he accused the Government of being a mass of hypocrisy in regard to the Woman's Suffrage Bill. Now, when he accused the Government, he accused every member of the Government. The words he used were if I remember, that he regretted that those two hon. and gallant gentlemen, Lieut. Small and Sergt.-Major LeGrow, were not in their places to support and defend a position which they were manifestly expected to support and defend. Now the hon. gentle man may have had honest intentions when he singled out those two gentlemen, but hon. members on both sides could only come to the conclusion that he cast an aspersion on these two gentlemen, that they were influenced by men higher up, that they were afraid to face the issue. That is my opinion, but I do not say that he had any intention of casting an aspersion against these two hon. and gallant gentlemen; but, I cannot see how the House could put any other construction upon it.

MR. FOX:—Thank you, that is the attitude adopted by the Hon. the Minister of Justice, and I give to you the same answer I gave to him. He stated that the insult I offered the two gentlemen was based upon the fact that I called the Government a mass of hypocrisy. I said, and I say now, that you could not apply my remarks to those two gentlemen any more than to yourself. That is just what I thought you would say, and it clearly shows that what I said could not be construed as a personal insult to these two hon. and gallant gentlemen. Now take it from a legal standpoint. The law says that if I make a certain statement about any body of men that you cannot apply that, which was spoken in a collective sense, individually.

MR. SCAMMELL;—I do not say that the hon. gentleman meant to insult Sergt.-Major LeGrow or Lieut. Small; but there could be no other construction put upon his words.

MR. FOX:—The statement that I made was construed by the Government members in one way, and in another way by my colleagues on this side of the House, and, therefore I appealed to an opponent to vindicate me. I do not know whether I should now appeal to Sergt.-Major LeGrow and ask him what he thinks of the matter. I could not face him in Western Bay if I had insulted him; I would not be able to look him in the face if I had said anything insulting about him.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the

matter to them referred, and 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.

Mr. MacDonnell asked the Hon. Minister of Justice what members of the Local Bar had been retained by the Government in connection with the Labrador Boundary Arbitration. What sums, if any, have been paid them on account. Is it intended to retain any other lawyers, and if so, whom? Can the Minister give any idea of what the costs of the arguing of this case before the Privy Council will likely amount, and within what period a decision is likely to be rendered.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

And it being past midnight

FRIDAY, July 2nd, 1920

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

Mr. Hibbs—I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Joe Batt's Arm on the subject of a modification of the Prohibition Act. The petition is very largely signed and I ask that the appeal therein be given due consideration.

Mr. Sampson—I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Lawrencetown on the subject of a modification of the Prohibition Act.

Mr. Guppy—I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Heart's Delight, Heart's Content and Trinity, on the subject of a modification of the Prohibition Act.

Mr. MacDonnell—I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Curling on the subject of an amendment to the present prohibition laws. I give the petition my hearty support and once more request the Government to consider this matter before the House adjourns.

Mr. LeGrow—On behalf of Mr. Small, the Hon. Member for Burgeo and LaPoile, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of that district on the subject of a modification of the Prohibition Act.

Mr. Bennett—I beg leave to present two petitions on the subject of a modification of the Prohibition Act. One is from Petty Hr., and the other from the city. I trust that these with all the other petitions presented on this subject will receive the consideration of the Government, and something told us definitely re their policy before this House closes.

Mr. Walsh gave notice of questions.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain resolutions which were read a first time as follows:

Administration of Justice: $353,-113.65.

The said Resolutions being read a second time it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein and the said Resolutions were agreed to.

Pursuant to notice and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act for giving effect to the Treaties of Peace between His Majesty and certain other Powers" 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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Chairman, the Law Clerk is entitled to more liberal allowance for the services he performs in the interest of his country. As I pointed out the other day, the Government asks him to draft important Bills for which he is remunerated such that he might regard as a fitting retainer to undertake that work. The same applies to the reporters. In their case I wish to draw attention particularly. They have worked harder this session than for many years back. I think it is most unfair and most unjust to vote them the same figure that they got years ago and for much shorter sessions. The same applies to other officials right down the line, and I would ask the Government to give this matter. earnest consideration. There is one vote that deals with newspapers. That brings me to a subject that I intended to refer to later on and it arose out of a discussion here the other night. When the Government newspapers appeared on the streets two nights ago they contained articles which, I for one, consider were a gross insult to the whole country. The papers I refer to are the 'Daily Star,' which has been waging war in a certain direction for many months past; and the 'Evening Advocate,' the official organ of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. When we referred to this matter in the earlier days of the session I thought that the House was one in an endeavor to kill this hideous thing once and for all. Now it is just as well for us to face the issue squarely and to clear this matter up and to remove it out of our political life, even if it hurts somebody else. We must admit, if we are honest wit hourselves, that there has been a concerted attempt by a certain section of the press within the past few months to divide this country on sectarian lines, and the worst part of it is the insidious fashion that it is done in. With a man who attacks in that manner it is hard to deal with him. You can deal with a man who attacks openly. but when he attacks in such an insidious way as the 'Daily Star' has attacked, one does not know which way to handle him.

I make the charge deliberately that a certain section of the Government press, and with the knowledge of certain members of the Government itself, have consistently given publicity to the vilest kind of stuff and with the one object in view. namely, the dividing of this country on sectarian lines, and as I have said already, the sooner we face that position and clear it up the better for all concerned; and the articles that appeared in the 'Daily Star" the other night is only a consummation of the filthy attempt and the rotten campaign that that paper set out to wage. We all know that the object of circulating this sort of propaganda was to try and set one denomination against the other in this country; we know that those unjust charges made were levelled against members on this side of the House; we know that members of the Oposition were acused of using sectarianism for political purposes and we know that the campaign launched upon by the "Daily Star" last fall when they hinted and insinuated that the 'Evening Herald" was entering upon a sectarian campaign had one object in view, and that objective they achieved. What odds, it

they painted the picture as it should be painted, but they painted it as it should not be painted. When I left the District of Bay-de-Verde a few days ago I got possession of a special edition of the St. John's Daily Star containing one of the most defamatory, inflamatory, and abusive articles that I have ever laid eyes on. It was directed against my honored and revered leader, Sir Michael Cashin, and was absolutely without foundation in fact and undoubtedly wrong. A few days previous to that it published another disgraceful article and along similar lines, abusing all and sundry. The object was to satisfy people of a certain district whose faith was different to mine. But the limit was reached on last Wednesday night and the man who wrote it should cringe and feel ashamed that he ever penned those lines. Now to all intents and purposes this country is divided today and the fault does not lie at the doors of the present Opposition. The position is that certain gentlemen have sown the wind and now reap the whirlwind. It is regrettable if gentlemen on the other side of the House are going to allow this to continue, because I lay the blame on certain members of the Government and on the Government press, with the exception of the "Evening Advocate," although the "Advocate" fell from my graces the other night. There was no necessity for that leading article that it had on the back of the page, but I suppose it was meant to buttress the attempt made by the other sections of the Government press and the nefarious object that it had in view. One of the chief charges made by the "Daily Star" in their article on last Tuesday night's debate was to accuse the leader of the Opposition because he said that the reason the Prime Minister was absent was that he was attending a Conference which his denomination was then entering upon. This statement was twisted, distorted and knowingly misconstrued and the man who wrote that article knew it was wrong when he was writing it. And not alone did he abuse the leader of the Oposition in that article, but he insinuated that Mr. Higgins, who had made some derogatory remarks on the question before the Chair, namely, the Housing Problem, had insulted the Loyal Orange Association, and that I had backed up Mr. Higgins. I entered the Assembly room at eleven o'clock and members of the House must have known that I took no hand, act nor part in it, and when the reference to which the "Daily Star" complained of was made, I was not in the Chamber at all. I do not know what Mr. Higgins had endorsed previously, but when I endorsed what he said he had spoken on the Housing Bill and said that the Government should make substantial provision in connection with the building of houses. I endorsed that then and I do so now. And then the writer of that contemptible article insinuates against us to suit his own vile purposes. The one occasion that I ever heard that expression referred to in the "Daily Star," was on a public platform in the District of Bay-de-Verde, when an Opposition candidate was asked "what he thought of 21-2 now." The significance of the expression was not known to me until the following day in the lower part of the district. I had thought at first that it was a mark that had been put upon our fish. I kept it to myself and never knew what it meant until certain enquiries led me to realize the second position. I am sure that nobody ever intended to insult any such Association or body of men in this country, and when the "Advocate" comes out and says that there was a deliberate attempt made to insult twenty thousand people in this coun-

try, I can tell them in reply that the Government members were the first to use that cry.

MR. LeGROW:—It's a lie.

MR. FOX:—It's not a lie.

MR. LeGROW:—It is a lie.

MR. FOX.—Pardon me; it's not a lie. Mr. Chairman, I ask you to take down those words and to ask the Speaker to take his chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN:—I must ask the Hon. Member for Bay de Verde to retract his statement.

MR. LeGROW:—Mr. Chairman, I did not mean to say that it was a lie for Mr. Fox; but that it was a lie for his informant.

MR. FOX:—I wish in future that when the Hon. Member makes a state ment that he be more clear about it.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—I would like to know what the Estimates got to do with sectarianism.

MR. FOX:—The explanation that I am making has much relevancy to the matter before the Chair.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—I have listened to your explanation, but you need not take three or four hours to make it.

MR. FOX:—I will take sufficient time as I feel is proper to refute the charges that you had in your newspaper. You write an article, make a charge and then you cannot accept an explanation. This is the opportunity and the only opportunity that we have to defend ourselves. Now you are going to hear it again. In reply to the hon. member for Bay de Verde, I may say that it may be a lie for my informant but I doubt it. I was present at a meeting when that remark was passed when a question was asked Mr. Puddester. The significance of the remark never dawned on me because it did not affect me one way or the other. If the Government press takes exception to any remark which they say is insulting to any section of the community they ought to chase their own members first.

MR. TARGETT and MR. SAMSON:—We all know it was insulting.

MR. GUPPY:—I consider it was insulting to the 20,000 members of that body in this Island. I am one who is connected with it and I would like to have the matter all explained.

MR. FOX:—I am not in a position to explain what it means; but I am creditably informed that there was no insult upon that Order or any member of it. But before the people get up and hold up their hands in holy horror they should first get after certain members of their own party who are members of that organization who are using it for their own political ends. If I were a member of it I would be the first to get up and strongly resent the attitude of anyone of any side of politics who had the temerity or the indecency to utilize it for political purposes. And I believe that every right-thinking man in that organization would take a similar position. We may be separated on a matter of faith but we must regard ourselves as Newfoundlanders after all, because the day is come when concerted action is necessary in an atempt to solidify our public life.

MR. SAMSON:—You will have to get a new leader; yes, you will, because your present leader——

MR. FOX:—How dare you abrogate to yourself the right of making those unseemly interruptions at will. You just take your seat while I have the floor and reply when I am finished. In reply to the hon. member I do say that a new leader is necessary.

MR. SAMSON:—That is what I meant.

MR. FOX:—I know your consider-

ation for members on his side is very touchy, but still it is not required. If his attempt to tear out the vitals of our public life is to be coped with you will certainly need a new leader. As regards the members on this side of the House, our hands are clean from a sectarian standpoint and I defy contradiction to that statement.

MR. TARGETT:—It makes me smile.

MR. FOX:—Does it? You think other folks are patterns of yourself. Have you the cold-bloodedness to say that my assertion is untrue?

MR. TARGETT:—Yes, I have heard the Hon. member telling lies before.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Chairman, I ask that these words used by the hon. member for Trinity be taken down by you and that the Speaker be called into the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN:—The Hon. member for Trinity has made a direct charge and I ask that the words be taken back.

MR. TARGETT:—Mr. Chairman, I did not mean to use any unparliamentary language. I meant to say that I knew Mr. Fox to tell lies before.

MR. FOX:—The Hon. member for Trinity does not give his own explanation. He tells what is given to him by the Minister of Justice.

MR. TARGETT:—If I used unparliamentary words I will take them back, but I cannot take back the lies you told the other day. You said that in Bay de Verde you saw stones two feet high on the road and you said that Tom Lockyer had eleven children. You know that was not true. Now decide that Mr. Chairman; you also made remarks concerning the Poor House that were not true.

MR. FOX:—Do you think you're talking to a crowd of children? Apparently you do. Do you think that while discussing such a serious subject that you can make cold-blooded interruptions in an unparliamentary way and with a pack of sheer nonsense draw a red herring across the trail? Let me inform you and every member on your side that any time any objectionable thing is said it is not going to be allowed to go by with impunity, first, on general principles, and secondly, because you cannot do it in parliament. The real position is that we are facing an issue in Newfoundland to-day whereby a concerted attempt is made to keep this country divided on denominational lines, and, unfortunately, I have to accuse the Government press of doing that, and if they had the courage to say that they were not doing it I would not mind as much, but when told of their filthy actions they lay the blame on other people's shoulders. I entered political life last Fall and conducted a clean campaign and no one can say that I ever once used such disgraceful tactics, but that I attempted, even at my own respect and to my own credit, to keep sectarianism out of the campaign. The same applies to my own colleagues. On any platform that I spoke from, particularly in the heart of sectarianism and where people were not supporters of my party, I appealed to the people to vote according to their consciences and not according to any other motive. I had hoped that when the new Government assumed office that they would try and keep that dirty thing from entering Newfoundland public life, but, unfortunately, my expectations were not fulfilled; and it is common knowledge that right down during the past few months it has been kept up by a section of the press and unnecessarily kept up, and, as I said in the opening days of this session that the men responsible for conducting political life in Newfoundland should be hounded out of it because they are a menace to decent society.

MR. SAMSON:—Hear, hear.

MR. FOX:—I only wish you would back up your endorsation of what I said towards a certain section of your party. It is no use in holding up our hands in holy horror, as words are absolutely useless, but the time is come when some of my friends on the Government side will have to unite with their friends on this side in a concerting attempt to fight this base thing to a finish, as it is discreditable to our individual constituencies and to Newfoundland as a whole. I think I can place my fingers on the two men who wrote those articles in the "Advocate" the night before last and which were directed against the Leader of the Opposition. These two men ought to be ashamed of themselves, to say the least of it. But it only goes to show that nothing is low and bad enough for these men to lay their hands on for the purpose of wounding an opponent and to gain their own political ends. The insinuation was made that an attempt was made to insult 20,000 citizens of this country. Now it would be more fitting for them to divert their efforts nearer home and put the shackles on some of their own party first and consider the advisability of restraining and to restrain them from their deliberate attempt to cross the people and to divide this country on the most reprehensible lines. If not they will have to take the consequences. I say it is a positive disgrace, and it is contrary to all sense of decency and self-respect that we should allow our selves to descend to such despicable line of warfare that have disgraced Newfoundland politics since last November and the sooner the "Daily Star", over which the leader of the Government, has influence, recognizes their duty and ceases their insidious attempt to disturb the harmony, good-will and quiet feeling of the people of Newfoundland, the better. I regret that the "Advocate", which I had praised in this House for being so clean during the political contest last Fall, should associate with a journal that has done nothing else than to deliberately tender to the prejudices and passion of our people. The whole thing is on a par with the conduct of the "Star" ever since politics was entered upon last September. But worst of all is that it sets out to do the work and then puts the blame on the other man. I am surprised that certain men in the Government ranks tolerate such an indecent state of affairs. If they are satisfied to let it go on, very well, but I hope that they will have the courage to take the blame for their work.

I personally object to the statement made in that paper that the Opposition, of which I am a member, deliberately insulted an organization that boasts of thirty thousand men; I object to the statement that the same Opposition insulted the Methodist body of this country, and for this very reason that some of my best friends are members not alone of that faith but also of that body of thirty thousand strong. That organization has done lots of good for the people of Newfoundland. And when we talk of good feeling, that very organization, which through certain sections of the Government press is holding up to the public scorn that it was insulted by another denomination, in the year 1893 obtained through that revered Catholic clergyman, Dr. Mullock, the same rights that were enjoyed by the Church of England and the Catholic Church. The Wesleyan body through the exertions of that gentleman got the same rights as the other denominations, and my attitude towards that body is the same today as it was in these days of 1893. I strongly object to this bigoted and narrow-minded conduct, and it is pitiful and indeed criminally neglectful to say that that paper has no other regard for

the good-feeling and good fellowship which has always been existent among the different denominations. The Catholics have served them once and will serve them again, and I feel sure that Episcopacy of which that Doctor of Church was its head, and which obtained for that body rights which every Britisher is entitled to, will whenever necessary give assistance to them. If the Daily Star questions the accuracy of my statements, I can give them date and data for it. That is all I have to say on this subject, but I cannot repeat too strongly that the time has come when the decent elements of the Government ought to join hand to hand with every other section of the country and call a finish to this disgraceful state of affairs, and the time will come when the accuracy of my reprobation will be unquestionable. If this kind of political propaganda continue you are sowing he wind and on to-morrow you will reap the whirlwind. There wil be no success to the men who deliberately advance their own interests through denominational channels and it will prove no stimulant to the good-fellowship which always existed throughout the country.

MR. MacDONNELL:—While this matter is being discussed and while I am alluded to by the Daily Star, I wish to make my position in the matter clear. The words I used then I will use now that the Prime Minister said he did not know the meaning of the term used in this House and I told him that he did, and if he continued to say that he did not know I would not believe him. If the Prime Minister will make a statement here now that he does not know the meaning of the term, I will withdraw my words. No one member on this side of the House or on the other side of the House can say that I mentioned sectarianism in this House. When we had a debate here for two days on it, I took to myself that distinction. I never alluded to it because I thought it too ridiculous to do so and my presence is the best answer to that and the best answer to the conduct of the district I represent, and leaves no room for doubt that sectarianism did not figure there. You do not mean to say that I got myself elected because I supported Squires? We live in perfect harmony in the District of St. George's, and in some cases there are many Church of England, in others Methodists and in others Roman Catholics and never has the slightest word been construed by these people in a narrow way and ill-feeling is neyer evident. I have among the best friends possess many belonging to different denominations than my own I wish to conclude my remarks which were interrupted a few moments ago. I was going on to say that despite the fact that a great sectarian campaign was carried on here in St. John's last Fall by the newspapers against Sir Michael Cashin, I won the district, and this is the best answer to the question whether there was any sectarianism carried on in St. George's. It is because of that fact that I resent from any man, whether in this House or out of it, I resent the idea that any sectarianism was stirred up in St. George's, and I defy any man in this House to get up here and give a different story in respect of St. George's. Since I have come down here to St. John's I have been continually set upon by the newspapers. If I had time to turn up the back files of the Daily Star I will find that I am blamed for a lot of this sectarianism, but the magnificent support I got from those people of St. George's is a sufficient answer to that man who writes that kind of scribble. On one occasion I had a private conversation with the Prime Minister and he told me he was not to blame or responsible for what appeared in the Star. Well, I want

to know who is responsible for it. I want to make this statement that I do not think Dr. Mosdell writes those editorials. There is but one to do it, and I know him well. The remarks made here in this House appear the next day in the Daily Star and the Advocate. There are two men in this House each being connected with one paper. The fact of this matter appearing in the two papers and the fact that two members in this House are connected one with one paper and the other with the other is not without coincidence. Men come up here to this House, and not having seen me before from only reading the newspapers accuse me across the floors of this House of sectarianism and which they cannot prove. I do not think that good enough for the district I represent. I want nothing of this sort to go to my district, and I want any man who knows that I was in any way connected with sectarianism to get right up here now and say so and we will have it out. I have not the habit of covering up my words. I may not use flowery rhetoric or sound logic, but I do use good plain English. But I do not want this session kind of stuff which we are handed out by the Star and which cannot be substantiated in this House. I thought it was necessary to make those statements and want them to go in the district not because it is necessary ordinarily but because it is so as the other papers which contain this false stuff are being circulated.

MR. SAMSON:—I would like to ask Mr. MacDonnell whether the leader of the Opposition used the words that "the Prime Minister used the two and ond one half trick in Bay de Verde?"

MR. MacDONNELL:—He did not use those words.

MR. SAMSON:—If the leader of the Opposition did not use these words he used words which reflected on societyism. And that is how this trouble in the papers has been brought about. But I do think that the 'Daily Star' has done an injustice to Mr. Fox and I think possibly many things were said which were better unsaid, but I think that Sir Michael Cashin grossly insulted the leader of the Government on using the two and one half trick down in Bay de Verde. I believe the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition mean to give fair play to everyone and trust that nothing will be actuated on a religious foundation but there will be equal rights for everybody. I am not afraid to get up here and express my sentiments, and I think the Government has been done an injustice.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—I said the two and one half trick cannot be used here.

MR. HIGGINS:—As in law cases occur which require no explanation and during the trial of which no witnesses in chief are produced on one side but the parties implicated are prepared to stand cross-examination so far as that side are concerned, the same applies here and I present myself for cross-examination. I have no explanation to make. I do not want to say anything. I know there is a certain kind of individual who keeps company with a certain class of people who move around to themselves. I do not belong to it. I took no part in the famous debate. I do not know what the two and one half means. And consequently not knowing what it means it is of no concern to me. But I do say that it is a reflection upon any gentleman when he personally endeavors to boost his cause under the guise of common falsehoods in the newspapers. Nothing of that kind can succeed or continue. It is just like a house which is very large but the sticks which make the foundation are not genuine and the appar-

ently fine house collapses. The same attempt is made when the suggestion is made which incidentally advertises Higgins, that Higgins was coupled with a debate in which he took no part and perhaps it is right for me to thank those connected with the 'Daily Star' for this free advertising which has been given me, and while the 'Star' was endeavoring to appeal to a certain class of men that very class of men have increased my law practice, and while this advertising continues it will continue to increase. Three parts of my clients belong to that faith known as Methodist. I have never heard of the two and one half trick, and, I want to say to all and sundry, that sincerely, on behalf of my family, that I am deeply grateful for not alone increasing Higgins' number of clients but also that Higgins' return in the East End is always assured when he feels like seeking it so long as the 'Daily Star' and the newspapers continue to advertise me as they do; and I do think that those who get abused have every reason to be grateful to those who were instrumental in giving them their free daily advertising. I can move around among all the different shades of men without experiencing the slightest danger of anybody arising out of a ditch and breaking out my brains, and I can run fairly well too; and, so far as I am concerned, I will enjoy the unfortunate conditions through which we have to live and which comes from those who ought to know better and from whom we expect better and who ought to put their time to better use. I want to thank every person connected with that paper for securing my election in the East End last fall, and I am deeply sensitive of the gratitude I owe them for my having obtained the record vote there. I am very thankful for all the abuse showered upon me, and I expect that all the politicians present and to come will be greatly boosted if they are given the same reception as I have been given and I think the form of advertising I am honored with is the most effective booster in politics. I never take notice of the papers but at the same time it is a poor sample of the kind of stuff which is in a man if this is the way one has to hit a man. It is an insidious suggestion when it is said that Sir Michael Cashin insulted the Methodist denomination. How was such an inference made? This is absolutely and deliberately fabricated. That Sir Michael Cashin jeeringly said the leader of the Government was attending the Methodist Conference is entirely untrue. That is a poor sample of politician. The paper that endeavors to forward along a cause by such fabrication without any semblance of truth is unworthy of the purpose which has brought it into being.

It is not an imbecile mind, but it is a sort of deranged mind. The reference made to Sir Michael Cashin that no children should be educated in the Methodist College is not one that any sane person will take seriously. After all, I expect Sir Michael has very little to do with that well-established and valuable institution. But there is one institution that we shall have an opportunity to refer to. For the present I propose to withhold any reference. There is an institution that should receive some consideration, an institution that will deal with lunatics at large. I think we can suggest that for this country and I think it would have some effect. I have no interest in the debate that has just taken place, but I must express my opinion of the incessant abuse that is being conducted by some of the newspapers. I differ from the other speak-

ers as to how the people will view the guttersnipe scribble. I know the humble fisherman will take it at its value, and use the dirty sheet for what it ought to be used. May I not hope that in volume and space it will increase.

MR. BENETT:—Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to delay the House very long. I must express sincere regret that circumstances should call for the debate that has taken place this afternoon. The time has come when propaganda of this kind must be stopped In the opening days of this session I had occasion to refer to certain appointments in the Upper Chamber. and to refer to the denominational representation in that Chamber, and because I had the audacity to contend that the Church of England had not its proper representation in that Chamber I was accused of rank sectarianism. The House of Assembly, the Executive Council, and the Legislative Council are all constituted on denominational lines notwithstanding the contention of my honorable friend the Minister of Justice, to the contrary. It is a system that has been adopted in all respects in the entire public service, but I was hailed before the public and held up as a sectarian firebug. I think Mr. Fox, the member for St. John's East, at the time handled the subject in a manner that did credit to himself. I was present at the time Sir Michael Cashin threw across the House to the leader of the Government some reference to two and a half. I do not know what two and a half means. I do not belong to any organization of which that is an emblem, and I knew nothing of its significance until I took up the 'Daily Star.' It is quite true that the paper that published that has taken every opportunity to vilify me personally. I pay as much attention to that paper as I do to the noise of a mule or a cat. The incident the other night was, in my opinion, simply a pure childish interruption which brought back from the Prime Minister the statement that he would no longer continue the debate. I was down in Bay de Verde and I received a cordial reception. I heard no reference to anything but party issues. In the meeting at Freshwater Mr. Puddister and myself laid down the condition of the campaign: there was to be no reference to religion and no personalities. My opinion was that the election was going to be tight, but that the Opposition candidate was going to win. I don't know of any trick work, and if there was any it was done silently in the last day or two.

I have no desire to enter into this controversy. I merely want to say that as a man, a friend, and as a citizen, there is no man in St. John's in whom I have greater confidence than Sir Michael Cashin. His name is a household word. He has stood on the floors of this House under different premiers, irrespective of what denomination. He happens to be a member of a certain denomination, but that makes no difference to me. I support him because I feel that he is the best man in sight at present, and to think that Sir Michael Cashin insulted any denomination or society deliberately is perfectly absurd. I think it is an unfortunate situation that members of this House should use the Government papers to sway the public mind in this manner. This country's division is this country's disaster. If we permit this we will be a laughing-stock and a bye-word among civilized men. Let us realize that we are all Newfoundlanders, and are here in the interest of a common country. Never did the country need greater unity

than at the present time, and to say that the red flag is going to be hoisted will spell ruin to the country. The sooner we realize the high duty that we have to perform the better. No matter what the personnel of the Government or the Opposition let us legislate as Newfoundlanders.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to speak much on this debate. I was in the House when some reference was made to two and a half. When two and a half was mentioned I thought it had reference to the Prime Minister, because when the Prime Minister was canvassing in the West End he used to go into the beer shops and shout for the crowd and tell them that if returned he would give them something better than two and a half.

Now I want to call attention to an article in the 'Daily Star' of June 2nd. The 'Star' calls us Seinn Feiners, and says that we are a wound in England's heart. But we gave our sons many of whom gave their lives in answer to England's call. That night I met a Protestant, a great friend of mine, and he told me that there was going to be an election in Bay de Verde, and that this was Mr. Squires' manifesto to Bay de Verde. He said, I supported Mr. Squires last time, and I know his tricks. The next day I saw in the 'Star' about the election in Bay de Verde. I care not what a man's religion is. I have many good friends in the L.O.A. and the United Fishermen in Portugal Cove. I go there and I am treated like a king. When I first heard about this matter I thought it was some reference to the Prime Minister and the modification of the Prohibition Act.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—The Hon. Sir Michael Cashin, Leader of the Opposition, has occupied the attention of the House for two hours in his criticisms of this Housing Bill. I now seek the attention of the House for ten minutes in which I feel sure the House will be satisfied that his criticisms have been fully answered. In the days of the National Government of which Sir Michael Cashin was Minister of Finance and Customs, the Municipal Council asked the Government for a grant of the sum of $30,000 for the erection of Workingmen's houses. Sir Michael Cashin as Minister of Finance aggressively opposed the grant and the Government rejected the application and declined to give any grant. At that date housing conditions were just as serious as they are today. Sir Michael knew their seriousness but aggressively opposed the application. In the autumn of 1918 the Hon. John Anderson wrote the Government of that day, the present Opposition, asking that his housing scheme might be considered, and, in keeping with the previous attitude of Sir Michael Cashin, the present leader of the Opposition, the Government replied in the following very definite words "nothing doing." Every application made to the present Opposition when they were the Government of the Colony, whether made by the Municipal Council or the Hon. John Anderson and his associates was flatly rejected. I feel, Sir, that Sir Michael is paying a very great compli ment to the Government when he urgues that during the few months that we have been in office we are capable of giving more serious and satisfactory attention to the Housing Problem than he and his associates were able to give to the problem during a period of three years when pressure was brought to bear upon him and his colleages to deal with this important matter. Sir Michael has offered a personal criticism of myself in suggesting that this Bill has been thrown

on the table of the House without any explanation. Sir Michael's memory is entirely at fault in this connection. The subject matter of this Bill was introduced in this House some few days ago in the form of resolutions. These resolutions were tabled and were fully discussed. Sir Michael himself supported the resolutions while he now opposes the bill—which is based upon them. All the information which Sir Michael seeks was then laid before the House. Sir Michael was present during the discussion, and was present when the information was furnished. The principle of this Bill was fully discussed and list of prospective shareholders was tabled; full information given as to the nominal capital of the company, the value of the shares, and, as a matter of fact, even the original correspondence between the Government and the Hon. John Anderson and others relative to the subject-matter of the Bill was laid upon the table of the House. The hon. member for St. John's East, Mr. Higgins, asked certain questions with respect to the subject-matter of the Bill, and the information which he sought was tabled in writing. The memory of the honourable the leader of the Opposition must be exceedingly faulty when he is standing on his feet, because he was present in this House when the resolutions were discussed and the information to which I have just referred tabled. In spite of that, he has repeatedly asserted during his lengthy speech that the matter had been brought before the House without explanation and that the company was not incorporated and that it had no capital. This House has already been informed on several occasions, Sir Michael Cashin being present at the time, that the company had been incorporated under the Companies' Laws of Newfoundland, and that while it had no paid-up capital, yet the Memorandum of Association was signed by a large number of strength who indicated the number of shares to which they were subscribers. The Company was incorporated free of cost under a Minute of Council passed under the authority of the Companies' Act which provides that a company incorporated for philanthropic purposes may under certain circumstances be incorporated without payment of the usual fees. The Bill provides that the company is to receive certain concessions, such as free entry for materials to be used and a guarantee of interest on bonds.

MR. BENNETT:—Was the agreement acceptable to the Government?

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—The concessions which the company desired to secure were discussed on several occasions with me by Mr. Anderson. I was also waited on by the Hon M. P. Gibbs and Messrs. McGrath, who was President of the 'Longshoremen's Union, and Linegar and Foley. The proposition submitted to me by the Hon. Mr. Anderson and his associates is the proposition which was embodied in the resolutions which have already passed this House, and is the basis upon which this Bill has been drafted. The only correspondence of which I have any recollection between the Government and the Company consists of a request by the Company for the concessions set out in this Bill. Their entire request has been fully met. The Hon. John Anderson has asked whether the Government would be prepared to guarantee a bankers credit to the amount of probably $50,000 for the purchase of supplies, etc., pending the collection of capital. The Government has agreed to give him a present guarantee of $25,000. The question of a credit for a further sum of $25,000 is

to be considered at a later date. The leader of the Opposition has attempted to suggest that the Bill before the House is one for which the Government proposes to take any credit. The observations of the honourable gentleman are entirely imaginary. No person who took the trouble to listen even intelligently, to the observations which I have made with respect to this matter both in the resolution stage and in its present stage could come to such a conclusion. This housing scheme is the result of the combined energy and co-operation of the Hon. John Anderson, Hon. M. P. Gibbs, Mr. James McGrath, President of the Longshoremen's Union, Mr. Michael Foley and some others. They have asked the Government for certain concessions, and the only credit the Government takes in connection with this matter is that it has granted the concessions sought, and has not behaved in the indifferent and discourteous manner towards this housing problem as Sir Michael Cashin and his associates have behaved during the past few years.

MR. HIGGINS:—This is not a Government project.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—Nobody has ever suggested that it was a Government project. I feel that I have made it abundantly clear to the House that the entire credit for the development of the idea belongs to the Hon. John Anderson, Hon. M. P. Gibbs, Mr. James McGrath, Mr. Foley and the other gentlemen who are associated with those gentlemen who are the leaders in the development of this scheme. The Government has granted their request. It is not in this Bill offering them any more than they asked for, nor is it offering them less. They put up a certain proposition to the Government, and the Government with alacrity and in the most friendly spirit acceded to it, thus showing an attitude towards the housing problem entirely different from the attitude shown by the present Opposition when they were in charge of affairs.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—(Interrupting): When these resolutions were introduced you told us that you would explain the whole thing fully when it was brought in as a Bill. You are here for the last half hour trying to cover up your mistakes. I care not how they shout or how you shout. I care nothing for you or your satellites in the gallery, brought in for the purpose. Never mind trying to get away from it. I have you right there now where I want you. The two and a half trick will not do you here.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—I do not understand what you mean by the 'two and a half trick."

MR. MacDONNELL:—You know alright.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—So that there may be no misunderstanding as to what Sir Michael Cashin and Mr. MacDonnell have said I desire to call the reporter's attention to their statements and ask that they be particularly noted. The words used by Sir Michael Cashin were "The two and a half trick will not do you here." The words used by Mr. MacDonnell were "You know alright."

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—There is no way of your getting out of it now, and I am just going to lay you bare.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—What are you going to lay bare, "the two and a half?"

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Never mind the two and a half. I have been used to that all my life.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—When Sir Michael Cashin used the term "two and a half trick" I did not appreciate what his insolent remark was, but I feel now that I understand.

I consequently decline to further debate this matter with Sir Michael Cashin, the Leader of the Opposition, or with Mr. James MacDonnell, who has also made an observation with respect thereto. I consequently, Mr. Speaker, take my seat.

MR. HIGGINS:—What is being done in the matter of the bonuses for the engineers at the Lunatic Asylum and General Hospital?

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—The bonus for the man at the General Hospital is under consideration by the Executive.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—I notice there is no increase for the Supt. of the Poor Asylum. Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word for Mr. Miller, because I think he should have been considered. In their choice of a Superintendent for the Poor Asylum the Government have picked out a good man. I know both Mr. and Mrs. Miller and I am sure the inmates of the institution of which they are in charge will be well looked after. I know of Mrs. Miller's charitable work and I am certain that whatever we give them will not be too much.

MR. BENNETT:—Has the Government considered the erection of a new Poor Asylum?

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—No, but the organization of the institution has been aranged for under the direction of Mr. Miller.

MR. BENNETT:—I endorse everything said by Mr. Vinnicombe with regard to Mr. Miller. I presume Mrs. Miller is the matron.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Miller's deceased son's widow is the matron.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—I would like to ask if an Inspector of Meats has been appointed yet.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—No.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—I understand there are some applications in?

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—I dare say there are the usual number of applications, as in all cases where a vacancy exists, but none has come under my notice particularly.

MR. HIGGINS:—That appointment was made on the recommendation of Mr. Bennett and myself on behalf of our constituents in both ends of the city. Public Health Officer O'Brien had no practical experience, and in such cases as the examination of slaughter houses, etc., great injustice was often done. People were prosecuted on the most flimsy charges; if their slaughter houses were built on the bank of a river they were brought before Court because the river didn't run through them. The result was that representations were made to the Government and Courtney was appointed. I would like the Prime Minister to table the correspondence in connection with his dismissal. Mr. Courtney was dismissed without cause and for no reason whatever. I am given to understand that the recommendation for his dismissal did not emanate from the Public Health nothing more nor less than to satisfy a personal spleen. If that is the case a great injustice has been done. Mr. Courtney was a well informed man Office and that he was dismissed for and I question if there are many better informed or better read men in the city than he is. He was a credit to the Department and I question if in the whole department there was a man, with the exception of Dr. Brehm himself, measuring up to his class. As to the need of a man like Courtney in that position, the members of this House will be surprised to know that the amount of imported meats, such as salt and corned meats, condemned last year was between for-

ty and fifty thousand pounds. Now if this condition existed last year, surely it is wrong to let it go unchecked in the future. If we want to ensure the quality of our food suppply the inspection of meat must be properly done and not give little perquisites to butchers in business. I would like to have that correspondence tabled. I will not anticipate too much but if Mr. Courtney was dismissed without cause, I will deal with the matter.

MR. BENNETT:—I would like to have a word to say before we pass this vote in reference to the position of Meat Inspector in this city. Mr. Courtney held that position at a salary of $300 per year. This was not sufficient for the gentleman to live on. As pointed out by Mr. Higgins such a man is required today not alone for the inspection of fresh meats but for the inspection of all salt meats, pork, etc. Quite a lot of work could be done in this connection. Such an official would be very essential especially during the present time when so much meat is being sent to the outports, some of which is unfit for human food. During the life of the late Government Inspector O'Brien held that position and later Mr. Courtney, who is a man thoroughly capable to fill the position. He is young and sober, honest and industrious, and I am sure that you would find no more suitable man. As to what are the Government's intentions in this respect I do not know. I was very sorry to hear that Mr. Courtney's services had been dispensed with. I think that the two positions of Public Health Officer and Meat Inspector could have been consolidated. I now wish to call the Prime Minister's attention to the second vote on this list and that is the vote for Child Welfare. Is that a mistake?

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—Yes, I think it is. Under the Morris Administration of which I was Attorney-General this was voted and it was decided to give $450. The $450 was not given last year. The W.P.A. and City Council and Public Health Department collected certain funds some time ago and they were short $450. They asked for this amount and it was paid. This year it is $750. That is an increase and not a reduction. What that $1920 is I do not know. There was no such vote last year but the Minister of Finance can give the information.

MR. MacDONNELL:—During the discussions a few days ago Mr. Coaker stated that he would not stand for a stenographer's salary being over $700.

HON. MIN. MARINE & FISHERIES —I don't intend to either. This lady will also be a clerk. You shouldn't draw my attention to it anyway. Do I infer from what you say that you want her salary reduced?

MR. MacDONNELL:—No, but I want all the others increased.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—This lady will not only be a stenographer but a general clerk.

MR. MacDONNELL:—Mr. Coaker it is good to see that you can't do every thing.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—The Smallpox vote has decreased, altho last year the number of cases were enormous. Rsidents of Bell Island and other places in Conception Bay submitted to voluntary vaccination and the doctors were paid the sum of twenty-five cents for each vaccination.

MR. MacDONNELL:—I'd like to say a few words in reference to this vote. I am glad that the Prime Minister has said that the cost last year was enormous. I received some infor mation some time ago. It is second-hand and I got it from the various departments. I will lay a general

summary of it before the House so that such things as this may be prevented from going on. Every doctor is entitled to the same treatment and Dr. Jones in 1918 treated 96 patients for smallpox.For this he was paid 50 cents per visit and 35 cents a mile and getting nothing for the return journey. If he happened to be out of his own place at the time another man was brought in there and paid $15.00. Several of the doctors are kicking because of this treatment and are now asking that they be paid $1.00 a visit and $1.25 per mile. Last year during the outbreak of smallpox at Avondale Dr. Gill was paid $15.00 per day for his work at that place. You are not going to get doctors in their own settlements to look after smallpox cases for 50 cents a visit and 25 cents a mile, when an outsider can come in and get $15.00 per day and the amount paid Dr. Gill for his services was $615 while $1600 was paid to the man who drove him. I think that $15.00 a day to a man coming in from an outside settlement is an outrage. A dollar a visit and $1.25 per mile would be enough.

MR. HALFYARD:—During the Flu Epidemic the doctors were paid $25 per day.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—That is what was paid in some instances and it was often difficult to get medical attendance for that figure.

MR. MacDONNELL:—Well, if they are going to take advantage of such conditions as these, then I think that it is high time to get to work and prevent it and I think it is about time to bring in a Bill to consider it. If a lawyer did this do you think he would be tolerated by the Law Society? I think that a local practitioner should get more than 50 cents a visit and 25 cents a mile. The 50 cents a visit may be all right but I think that their travelling allowance should be increased.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—It is not correct to say that there has been no increase by the Government in the Poor Grants. The total sum of money paid by the Colony annually under the head of Public Charities is not less than one million dollars That represents a tax of $4.00 on every man, woman and child in the Island on Public Charities account. The Old Age Pension grant has been increased by the sum of $10,000. It is quite true that the specific vote for the relief of the poor is approximately a matter of a quarter of a million and has not been increased, but the Commissioner of Public Charities advised me that that vote is sufficient for the purpose for which it is intend ed. In the event of any marine or other disaster, destruction by forest fires or special calamity from any other cause, special provision has been made in the past and will be made in the future by the Executive Government to meet such special demands, but for the usual and regular assistance to the deserving poor a quarter of a million dollars, or a tax of $1.00 for every man, woman and child in the Island, is regarded by the officials in charge of Poor Relief as sufficient. There are certainly very many cases of serious hardship, but that hardship is due not so much to a lack of funds as to the unfortunate method which appertains in some sec tions of the administration of the funds available. As a matter of fact the total increase in Public Charities accounts is $200,000. I appreciate the fact that this increase does not go directly into the pockts of the poor, but it is for the benefit of the poor. This total of $1,000,000 is not $1,000,000 which is being distributed amongst the poor people of the Island. Only approximately $350,000 is being so distributed, but the Poor Grant is for the poor. The General Hospital, which up to the present has

been a free institution, is an institution primarily for the poor. The Lunatic Asylum, which is practically a free institution, is primarily an institution for the poor. There are exceedingly few paying patients at the Asylum for the Insane. The money which is expended in connection with the prevention of infectious diseases is largely a payment on account of the poor. The doctors who attend infectious diseases in the wealthy classes are not doctors paid at Government expense. In the cases of quarantine the large expense of maintenance of families is the maintenance of the families of the poor. If the house of a poor man is quaranined, he and his family are looked after at Government expense. If he is a man who can afford to pay his own expenses, then he does not claim the Public Charities account for his main tenance while he is under quarantine. The vote for travelling expenses of patients to and from the Hospital, medical attendance and the votes for Orphanages, training of the Blind, training of the Deaf and Dumb, and the numerous votes for philanthropic and charitable organizations are for the assistance of the poor. I consequently feel that having regard to the revenue of the Colony, one million dol lars is a very liberal vote under the head of Public Charities, and, having regard to the limited wealth of the country, $4.00 for every man, woman and child in the Colony is a very sub stantial taxation for that purpose.

In answer to an inquiry which was made by one of the members for St. John's East, as to the Poor Asylum, I have to say that up to quite recently the Poor Asylum was horribly managed. This was not due to the carelessness or callousness of the Superintendent or his assistants, but it was due to the fact that the Superintendent had for years been applying for a pension. He was quite incapable of doing any work, and were it not for the fact that the matron was a very capable woman, the situation in connection with that institution would have been infinitely worse than it was The Poor Asylum has long been known as he "saddest place in Newfoundland." Shortly after I took office my attention was called to the condition of affairs at the Poor Asylum by the presentation of the Grand Jury. A Committee of Council was immediately appointed to look into the matter. Reorganization was undertaken. The Superintendent, who for years had been applying for a pension, was pensioned. Mr. A. W. Miller, a man of kindly disposition good executive ability and industry, was appointed Superintndent; the wife of his deceased son was appointed matron, and from the reports that I have received from time to time since the appointment I am satisfied that he is pursuing a policy of reorganization and improvement in connection with the conduct of the institution and that it is now very creditably run and the condition of the inmates has improved immeasurably. The Government does not at the present moment contmplate the building of a new Poor Asylum, much as a new Poor Asylum appears to be needed, but the reason why a new Por Asylum appears to be needed is that its management has been very unsatisfactory, rather than any grave defect in the building itself.

True, it is admitted by all that it would be a very great improvement if the Government felt the Colony could afford the expenditure of half a million dollars for the erection of a new building. In answer to the inquiries which have been made as to the policy with respect to the General Hospital, I must say that I have noted with great pleasure the unanimous support which the Opposition has giv-

en to the Government's idea of putting the Hospital upon a commercial basis. At the present time the Hospital is an absolutely free institution. Men and women of wealth are treated at the Hospital, and are treated free; they are not allowed to pay. In many cases payment has been tendered and refused. I have in mind one particular case well known to honourable members of the Opposition, in which a gentleman of wealth and standing in the community, demanded the right to pay for the treatment which he received at the Institution. He was told by the Superintendent that no payment could be accepted. Several years ago the Hon. Mr. Bennett will remember the Board of Commissioners recommended a scale of fees for all patients, those who could pay to be called upon to pay; those who could not pay to be paid for by the Department of Public Charities. That policy was approved of by the Morris Administration, of which I was Attorney-General. It was also approved of by the Morris National Administration, of which I was Colonial Secretary. I gather from the observations which have been made by some of the honourable members opposite that it was approved of by the subsequent Lloyd administration and also by the still subsequent Cashin Administration, but it was felt that it could not at these several times be put into effect because elections were pending and such a step might be used as political capital by an Opposition against the Government that took it. Since I have taken office I have had several interviews with members of the Hospital Commission with a view to putting the scale of fees adopted by the Morris Administration, confirmed by the Morris National Administration and also confirmed by the Lloyd and Cashin Administration, into effect, and I am glad to note that this policy has the endorsation of the honourable members opposite, particularly the endorsation of the Hon. Mr. Bennett, the member for St. John's West, who was Colonial Secretary of both the Morris and Cashin Administration. I want to make it very clear that this policy will not militate against the interests of the poor. It will, on the other hand, relieve the Hospital of some of the pressure which it at present receives from a class of people who are undoubtedly able to pay, but who nevertheless have the natural tendency to take advantage of a free institution and consequently occupy beds at the General Hospital because it is a free institution, when if the General Hospital were an Institution at which a charge would be made they would take the treatment at their own homes. There is also this advantage and that is, that medical men very often urge patients to go to the General Hospital for minor operations which might just as well be performed in the patient's home. Putting a reasonable scale of fees into effect will consequently lighten the burden on the General Hospital to some extent at least and thus give the poor a better oportunity of being treated, as also all who have to face such major operations and important treatment as cannot be satisfactorily undertaken at their homes or in the several private hospitals of the city. Those who are poor and unable to pay pay their medical and hospital expenses paid for them through the Department of Public Charities, and those who can pay will be expected to pay, and I feel that in ninety-nine cases out of every hundred, will be glad to pay, as Newfoundlanders as a rule are not the sort of people who are looking for charitable assistance

and expect to get surgical, medical and hospital treatment at the expense of somebody else.

Reference has also been made to the supply of Artificial Limbs. Up to the immediate present an arrangement has existed between the Government and Messrs. Rowley Brothers, of Chicago, under which a member of the Rowley firm would visit Newfoundland once or twice ayear and look after the matter of the suplying of artificial limbs to those who required them. The calamities of war have added very considerably to the number of artificial limbs required, with the result that I took this matter up with the Civil Re-Establishment Committee last Autumn and on arrangemnt was arrived at with Messrs. Row ley Brothers whereby two soldiers who were taking Civil Re-Establishment courses were taken by Mr. Rowley to Chicago and today are being trained there as artificial limb experts. Mr. Rowley visited Newfoundland a few months ago, brought the two men with him, installed some necessary apparatus for them to undertake the work, handled all the cases which required attention, took the men away with him again, and this autumn or next spring they will be able to come back to Newfoundland as expert mechanics in this industry

MR. HIGGINS:—A present the total vote to the poor is $300,000. For the Lunatic Asylum we have voted $140, 000. You can't call that a poor vote. For the General Hospital we have voted $175,000. You can't call that a vote for the poor. For Public Health we spend $160,000; this is for the benefit of the community. For protection of tne greater part of the community we pay $45,000 to the Fever Hospital and in point of fact the million dollars for charity now boils down to $380,000. I have no further objection to the vote

MR. WALSH:—We practically got a guarantee that consideration would be given the district of Placentia and St. Mary's, and I hope that a man will be sent up there to locate a place to build a fog alarm. We need two fog alarms up there, but if we got one placed there this year we will be satisfied. If th Government can see their way clear next year to build another the people of Placentia and St. Mary's will be grateful for their work.

MR. MacDONNELL:—When I went to the District of St. George's I pledged that a light would be put there. I find that this year $25,000 has been voted for this purpose, but no light has been put there yet.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—We will carry out all our pledges, Mr. MacDonnell.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if that $800.00 voted for Cape St. Francis light is a salary for the keeper.

HON. MIN. MARINE & FISHERIES —Yes. that's the keeper's salary.

MR. VINNICOMBE—I went to Cape St. Francis some time ago and I had a look at the place and I think the keeper there is worthy of an increase in his salary. His place is shining; all the brass work and the rest of the house is kept very nice and clean, and I think he takes an interest in the place. I think that the Minister should consider his case.

MR. HIGGINS:—Are we going to proceed any further this evening?

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—Might we not proceed to the Marine and Fisheries vote?

MR. HIGGINS:—There are a few hon. members that would like to say a word upon that vote and who are not present tonight.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—We are hoping that we will be able to close this session of the Legislature by the end of the present week and we would

like to get through as much business as possible.

MR. HIGGINS:—There are a few things in the vote for Roads and Bridges that some of the hon. members who are absent may like to consider.

HON. MIN. OF JUSTICE:—Before the committee rises I would like to reply to a question asked by the hon. member for Ferryland some time ago. He stated that there has been no issue of uniforms to the firemen for the past twelve months. I have made some enquiries and have secured the following reports from the Inspector-General and the fire chiefs.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES:—The other day some friends on the Opposition asked a question in reference to the Edmund Donald. In reply, I might say that she carried 300 passengers and had boat accommodation for 660.

MR. MacDONNELL:—How many boats did she carry?

HON. MIN. MARINE & FISHERIES —About 20.

MR. MacDONNELL:—What about wireless?

HON. MIN. MARINE & FISHERIES —She had no wireless.

MR. HIGGINS:—I would like to ask the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs if he will inform the House why W. B. Moss has been dismissed.

MINISTER POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS:—It was considered very desirable that a change be made. This was done by the Executive Government.

MR. HIGGINS:—I ask that if there was any correspondence in reference to this dismissal that I would like to receive copies of same.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—Mr. Chairman, the engineer at the General Hospital was rated the same as he is now but he had a bonus which has now been cut out, while the engineer at the Lunatic Asylum has his bonus still. Why is this?

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—That has already been explained. The position is this. The work at the Lunatic Asylum was such as to entitle the man there to an assistant but the engineer preferred to do the extra work himself and get the bonus. At the same time the matter of a bonus for Mr. Moore is under consideration.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—Don't you think it is an insult to an engineer to have him down for the same amount as the firemen are getting? This man has the responsibility of the whole thing on his shoulders, he has to answer all calls and still you have him down for the same as the firemen. It is unfair and I hope it has not been done because of political pull. If you don't want to keep the man on, then fire him but if you want to know what he is doing ask the doctor and he will be in a position to tell you. I am not causing any outcry against the firemen getting $1170, they are worth it, but what I contend is that the engineer should receive more than the fireman. I don't know how the men on the other side can go back to their districts after what they have done in the matter of increases. There was a time that I sat outside the bar of this House and I heard Mr. Jennings say that he would take neither a position nor a salary from the Government but when he heard the jingle of the gold he fell from grace. I also remember Mr. Coaker saying that the people of St. John's did nothing but go to football games and watch a crowd of men chase a ball around the field like so many cats chasing a mouse, ride in motor cars and go to the Golf Links, and now Mr. Coaker does it all but go to the golf links. I don't know how the people will treat him when he goes back to them after this ses-

sion. God knows we have enough poor people waiting day by day to draw their few miserable dollars, and I really don't know how these men on the other side can go back after all we've heard about them the past eight or ten years fighting for the cause of the poor down-trodden fisherman. I believed in Coaker one time, I supported him the last election, but he also fell from grace when he heard the tingle of the gold. Now I trust, Mr. Chairman, that the widow's mite will be looked after.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

At half-past four of the clock, the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod appeared at the Bar of the House with a message from His Excellency the Governor, commanding the attendance of the House in the Council Chamber

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker and the House attended the Governor in the Council Chamber.

And Mr. Speaker and the House being at the Bar of the Council Chamber His Excellency the Governor was pleased to assent to the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Appointment of a Temporary Commission for the City of St. John's and other purposes"

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed certain Resolutions and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

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

The remaining orders of the Day were deferred.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bills sent up entitled respectively "An Act Respecting Local Affairs in Outport Districts," and "An Act to Amend Chapter 127 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled 'Of Companies' without amendment.

Mr. MacDonnell asked the Prime Minister

(1) If the Government has been considering the purchasing of the mining property of the St. George's Coal Company;

(2) What amount is being paid for same;

(3) If it is the intention to begin development operations in the near future.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, in moving that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday next, at 3 in the afternoon, I desire to answer two questions which were put to me by the honourable the leader of the Opposition, Sir Michael Cashin, during the course of his lengthy speech. Sir Michael asked me if I were in a position to inform the House as to what was the attack that he made upon the Honourable the Minister of Marine and Fisheries some days ago. He read an editorial from the 'Daily Star' newspaper in which the statement was made that Sir Michael Cashin had used vile and offensive language and had made an attack upon Mr. Coaker. I regret that I am not in a position to answer Sir Michael Cashin's question, because I was not in the House when Sir Michael made the indecent exhibition to which editorial reference was made. I consequently cannot give the House any information whatever as to what Sir Michael said on that occasion. My only knowledge of the unseemly occurrence consists of the newspaper references and the information which I have from various members of the House who have discussed it in my presence. As to the editorial in question, I was very much amused at Sir Michael's saying that when he was speaking I was writing the editorial at my desk, that he saw me writing it.

In view of the fact that I was not in the House at the time I can readily believe that Sir Michael sometimes makes statements which are not in accordance with the facts. As a matter of fact, I was not aware of the contents of the editorial in question until Sir Michael Cashin read this evening the report of the proceedings which appeared in the 'Daily Star' as I did not have the opportunity of seeing any of the city newspapers of that day's date.

The second question which Sir Michael Cashin asked me was in the nature of a statement rather than a question. He said that during the course of the Bay-de-Verde campaign he had received a telegraph message to the effect that on one or more platforms in the District of Bay-de-Verde I had stated that the brand which would be put on fish would be a 2 1-2 brand. I fear that Sir Michael must have drawn upon his inimagination in this case, just as fully as he must have in the other instance to which I have just referred. I do not propose to venture any opinion as to whether Sir Michael did or did not receive any such message, but I do know that I did not on any public platform or otherwise during the course of the Bay-de-Verde campaign or at any other time, make any such statement, nor was such a statement made in my hearing by any person, nor, as a matter of fact, did I ever hear the words "two and a half" used directly or indirectly, openly or by insinuation in relation to fish or any other matter, during the entire campaign. I regret that Sir Michael should so frequently base utterances delivered by him from his position as leader of the Oposition in this Chamber upon nothing more substantial than a deluded imagination.

MR. WALSH:—As the Committee arose, Mr. Chairman, I was about to make some remarks on the Public Charities vote, but before doing so I would like to point out another injustice. It is unnecessary for me to add anything to what has already been said with reference to the Commissioner and staff of this Department. Mr. O'Dwyer is above reproach as the head of that Department; he is a man who cares nothing for party politics and who cares less what position or influence a politician may have. He will, under all circumstances, do what he considers to be his duty. I understand that the Commission placed him in the class of the Deputy Heads. I understand that the Assessor is to be considered and I hope that Mr. Dwyer will also be considered. In the other cases of this Department there is Mr. Dunphy, who I learned since going to my tea, has been in the Department for twenty-six years. He is down for fifteen hundred dollars and he is called upon to do very particular work, but his salary remains the same and similarly with the other officials. It is most unfair and I trust the Government will reconsider this vote. Now to come to the vote for casual and permanent poor. This may be an oversight or a misprint, but before I take my seat I want to make one more appeal to the private members of this House who have more association with this class of person than perhaps the ministers have, to do all they can to induce the Government to increase this amount of $214,000. These men must know the actual necessity that exists for an incrase in this miserable dole. During the days of war when with good fisheries and good prices for our products we enjoyed the greatest of prosperity, these poor people were badly off enough, because it matters not to them whether fish is two dollars or twenty, they get the same pittance but now that prices have gone even beyond the means of the ordinary person, their plight is very much worse. Before this vote

goes thru I hope it will be reconsidered and increased by at least a hundred per cent. It is nothing short of criminal to vote ourselves and our well-to-do friends increases of two, three and five hundred per cent and to increase other votes for purposes that are not at all deserving, and to do nothing for the poor widow and orphan. I do not desire to longer delay the time of the House, Mr. Chairman, except to riterate the injustice we are doing the poor unfortunate people who are depending on this vote for the wherewithal to live.

SIR. M. P. CASHIN:—Mr. Chairman, before the passing of this vote I would like to join in the protest against some of these increases and to say that in the proposal made by the member for Placentia, Mr. Walsh, I heartily concur. It seems hard, it seems cruel, it seems unkind, it seems unjust, it seems unfair, to find that we come here, a respectable looking crowd of men, and cooly increase every vote under this head except that for the relief of the poor. Have we any conception of what we are doing? Have we any feeling whatever for these people? We increase our own salaries but we ignore those who are actually suffering want. This is not the doctrine preached by the gentlemen on the other side bfore the election. There is a balance of three mil lion dollars to the Colony's credit and yet there is not a single protest from the other side against this vote. Are these gentlemen satisfied that these people are not in need? Are they satisfied that the widow and orphan can live on thirty dollars a year? There is not a member on the other side but understands as well as I do the circumstances under which the poor who are depending on this vote exist; still centincreases from thirty to five hundred pr cent are made in salaries but no attempt is made to increase the mite that is handed out to the widow. Surely it must be a mistake. Is the Minister of Finance so cold, so callous, so dead to humanity as this? Is West and to the country last fall? Is this what he promised to St. John's it because the people are poor that no notice is taken of them, while we increase our own salaries? Personally I do not think that there is any explanation that can be offered for it. I for one will join with the hon. member for Placentia in entering a protest against such treatment, and I am sincere in this. We are voting ourselves $30,000 increase for coming here for a couple of hours a day for eight or ten weeks. I don't know who asked for this increase. I am sure nobody on this side of the House did; and I am prepared to give my share of it to the widows and orphans; but it is idle for me to talk in this direction. The members on the other side have made up their minds and nothing will move them .It is strange how quickly gentlemen can change their minds and their actions. It is not so long since the people inside of this House and outside of it heard of some of those on the other side beseeching us when we were over there to double the old age pensions, but what, I ask, have they done since they have been there? They made all kinds of promises to get votes and they did everything they knew how to get here, and all they have done in return is to increase their own salaries.

It is not unreasonable to ask to make the vote for the relief of the poor six or seven hundred thousand dollars. Just imagin $30 for an individual to live on for a year. It may be said, and with a great deal of truth, that the widows and orphans in the outports may have other sources of revenue in the way of having land of their own with which to rear vegetables; but why not take into consideration the widows and orphans in St. John's

who have no resources and who are living in top flats with scarcely a place to lay their heads. Why not the Government wake up and realize what they are doing in this direction? Likely they will go on for a couple of sessions and then nearing the end of their term of office they will come in and ask this House to double or treble this vote, but the most disgusting part of it is to the persons who are in want and who placed their confidence in the Government of the day and who are looking forward to the Government of the day, in the light of the fact that you are increasing your own sessional indemnity by five hundred per cent and you have increased virtually every salary on the Civil Service list from fifty per cent downwards and in many cases that amount upwards. Here you cannot offer any explanation and are not making any attempt to offer any as to why you have not increased this dole for the poor widows and orphans of the country. It's true that the most we can do on this side of the House is to recommend and protest, and on behalf of the Oposition, I protest against the passing of this vote in its present form There is no reason whatever according to the rosy statements contained in the Budget that was prsented to this House a few days ago, and according to the reserve cash that you have in credit in the Bank of Montreal, why you should not double this grant this session for the relief of the poor. Now after leaving the grant for the poor with a great deal of reluctance, I come to the General Hospital. What are you doing and what is your policy in this connection? Is it your intention when this House closes to charge fees to all patients who go there for treatment? Are you going to take any vote before this House closes to provide for the number of people that are waiting patiently to enter that institution at the present time? I understand that there are over fifty patients in the city from different outports waiting for immediate admission to the General Hospital. I also understand that Dr. Fraser has an hospital able to accom odate over forty children patients and that arrangements were made between the Governmnt and Dr. Fraser to accomodate only 15 children. Now why 15, if there is sufficient accomodation for 40? There are children here in the city from the outports awaiting to get admission there to be operated up on and many of their cases need immediate attendance, I understand. Why should you limit the number of patients for that institution if the accomodation is there? I would like to know before this vote passes this House if you are going to collect a fee in the future at the General Hospital? Are you going to try and collect a fee from anybody who is not prepared to pay it, or are you going to collect it through the Poor Commissioner's Department? I understand that the Government is considering that matttr and I draw the attention of the House to it now and would ask the Prime Minister and Colonial Secretary to state the programme of the Governmnt in relation to it.

I would also ask what is the intention of the Government with reference to fire sufferers throughout the Island? I understand that in several parts of the Island, apart from Feryland District, several families have been burn ed out and have lost savings of a lifetime. As to the District of Ferryland which I represent, I might say that I had a report today stating that a number of people had lost all their belongings in that district within the past week or so. At Cappa Hayden, just above Renews, a family named Guiney, very industrious and well-off fishermen, had all their property destroyed by fire, including a lovely dwelling house, considerable cattle, barns, fishing gear and all valuable

property. A week ago these were independent people; today they are living in a barn at Broad Cove and looking to the charity of their neighbors for support. Coming further down the shore to Mobile, which is a small settlement and containing few families, the people there also lost all their fishing gear and dwelling houses. The destruction to live stock and other property alone was such that it would cost over twenty thousand dollars to replace, apart from the destruction done to the forest and timber property surrounding the place. I know of one family there named Quirk that was cleaned out altogether and with nothing left, except what they stood in. Some families removed their provisions and supplies that they had for the summer down to the waterfront, the people having to clear out of thir dwellings owing to the intense smoke. The next morning they found that the sparks had blown down to the sea-shore and everything along that section, including furniture from the houses, fish and provisions were burned. One large trap skiff, which was made fast to a stage, had caught fire and drove to sea. Surely goodness, the Government will do something to relieve those people. Similar happenings occurred at Witless Bay and I wrote Dr. Campbell this morning with reference to the whole matter, asking him to bring the matter before the Government. I also wrote Dr. Campbell when the fire was raging furiously up in that district, and to his credit, he promptly went up there and did all possible, bu it was a case of locking the stable door when the steed was stolen. I told the whole story within the past ten days in his House and I told what progress the fires were making along that shore, and I told how such contingencies were grappled with in the past by governments. I put it right up to the Government and showed them how they disregarded the appointments of the right men to look after the controlling of fire in that settlement. I pointed out that during the past seven or eight years since the inception of the Southern Shore railway there was very little destruction as a result of engines; but in May last an order went forth from the Government and all the wardens who were there for years were dismissed. If they had waited until July or August to do this there might be some sense in it, because the vegetation season is on and sparks from the trains are more liable to start forest fires. Nearly every day within the past month we have had fires on that shore. Although I understand that the fires that took place at LaManche and Mobile were not started by the trains but by trouters or by men who were three or four miles in the country rinding; but the district has suffered heavily at the present time as a consequence. I hope that the Governmtnt will do something for these people living in that territory. Just imagine families going to bed at night quite independent and find themselves absolutely destitute in the morning. The splendid valley of La Manche, which was so useful to the people of the upper part of the district in supplying timber and planks of all kinds, has been burning for the past four weeks and up to four days ago not a hand was raised by the Agriculture and Mines Department to stop any of the fires. All the timber around the place and almost right up to Salmonier has been burned, and Mr. Bennett, who was in that section recently, can bear me out in this. The Crane family at La Manche were burned out and Mrs. Crane, an aged lady, lost her life, her skull being found yesterday among the ruins. I hope that the Government will take this matter into their serious consideration as I believe that those who suffered from forest fires all over the country should be compensated to some extent.

In the past it was the practice of previous governments to help in that direction. I knew of one gentleman who lost a lot of property in a northern district and we sent down a Commissioner to look into the matter and upon his report we spent thousands of dollars to relieve the people who suffered. I hope that Dr. Campbell will urge upon the Government to appoint a Commission to enquire into this matter of relief himself. I had a request today from some people in my distrct asking that some fencing be sent out, and I sent some myself, because many of the fences of the little gardens surrounded and burned by the forest fires were more or less destroyed. We know that the burning of the fences of the gardens of these poor little means much to them, because their crops are in the ground and the fishery is now on and they have no time to spare. So I trust that if Dr. Campbell, on behalf of the Government, intends to do anything, that he will act promptly.

While on these Estimates I would like to say a word or two with respect to the last debate that we had in this House, and in reply to the report of the 'Daily Star' on the proceedings. I want to draw the attention of this House to the scurilous and infamous charge made in that paper by a gentleman who has a seat in this House and by a gentleman, who, if he did not write that article, must have inspired it. Further than that I think it is only fair to me and to this side of the House and to our supporters outside this House that you will bear with me, Mr. Chairman, while I read the report of the proceedings, as contained in the 'Daily Star', and the scurillous attacks made on members of this House. But to begin at the beginning I would like to refer to an article published in the 'Star' under date of June 1st, and after reading it, I will ask you your opinion, and the opinion of this House and the opinion of respectable folks outside this House, as to whether it is according to "Hoyle." I would have referred to it the day after it appeared, but because it left an impression on my mind after reading it then that it was meant for a purpose. It was written on the eve of the Bye-election in Bay de Verde and for the purpose, firstly, to draw the attention of the Opposition and to draw them into a debate on it, and secondly, it was written to the voters of Bay de Verde district. I did not comment upon that article until the following day, but I bore it with patience until now. I will read it to the House and then ask the author for an explanation. I may say that the article was written in my presence in the House. Here's what it says:

(Reads article)

Well now, Sir, all I say to that document is that it was written for a purpose; that was written as a manifesto by Mr. Squires to the people of Bay de Verde. It was written for its effect in Bay de Verde. A document covering the policy of the Government went forward. Inasmuch as he sent this document there he also wrote or inspired it, and it could not get into the paper without his knowledge or consent. This now I leave to an intelligent public to judge and leave it to their consideration as to what it means. This certainly does not mean that it was written for an intelligent district. It was written to arouse the feeling of that district in a certain direction. It was written for a purpose by the Prime Minister, and as far as I am concerned and as far as my associates are concerned, we have fought a square and manly fight against him. And that is what we are prepared to do in this House

and need not go behind the columns of a newspaper. But Premier Squires is not prepared to remain in this House and take what is coming to him. Such filth to hand out to an innocent people and that is their proper appellation if they take notice of it. It was written to take advantage of their religious feelings. Every move in every direction since that was written until the poll was declared is corroborated by the conduct of the Prime Minister. I charge Mr. Squires that he either wrote that or inspired it, and it did not get into the paper without his consent. That is an insult from beginning to end. Now here is another article, and I am glad Mr. Bennett and the Postmaster General are present. It is headed "Nothing Doing." This was also penned by Mr. Squires. I explained that on the 29th. (reads). Then here is another article; but, before leaving this one, I might draw the attention of the Postmaster to it, and, may I ask him, if I had any controversy with him about that matter?

HON. MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS:—I do not think we did.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—(Reads article.) That is the second manifesto sent to the people of Bay de Verde. I challenge the Prime Minister right here and now that he wrote that, and if he did not write it he inspired it, and it was sent broadcast to the country. My attitude towards every denomination has been and is contrary to what has been penned in that document and I want to state right here and now that I am not afraid or ashamed of what my attitude has been towards any denomination since I have been in a position to render any help in that direction. And I have helped education for the past four or five years just as much for the Methodists as the Prime Minister has. At any time when a call has been made upon me from that body or any other body of educationalists for the past four years I was not the lowest on the list of donations to forward that movement. That article which I have just read to the public and the House was written by Mr. Squires for a purpose. It was written against me to stir up the feeling down in Bay de Verde because I was leader of the Opposition and a Roman Catholic. The reason why that was done is because that gentleman after being nine months in office he sees, according to his manifesto issued last year, that he is guilty going to these people and knowing that he is guilty in not having done anything in carrying out his manifesto he produces this. In the first part of the manifesto he says that I atacked Mr. Coaker because he was not here. Mr. Coaker knows that I am not afraid to attack at any time an attack is necessary. And what I have to say to Mr. Coaker I will always say to him right here and I am always prepared to do. And I challenge Mr. Squires to tell this House what I said about Mr. Coaker when he was absent. I will not alone say what I have to say but I will also substantiate it. These articles were written, as I have already stated at the beginning of my discourse, for a purpose, and I leave that purpose for the consideration of the intelligent men and women of the country. There is no question about it. You do not want me to come out 'flat-footed' and tell you why it was written. It is written all over it and as far as I am concerned and the abuse of the 'Star' is concerned that contemptible gentleman goes outside this House and goes to that paper and vilifies me in a descriptive way such as no other can do; but it will have not one bit of ef-

fect on the people who sent me to this House. I have not the advantage of education as the gentleman on the other side of the House has. I was a poor fisherman's son. I was not a relieving officer's son. I could not be sent to college to remain for any degrees. This I must admit and still after all the gentleman on the other side has accomplished and will accomplish why take notice of my action in the matter. I have fought him squarely and honestly, and I do not care for any statement in his paper. Some time ago, and rightly so, Mr. MacDonnell said that people were brought from abroad to do "scavenger work" and to hound decent people and hold them up to ridicule as was never done before. But what will happen? I have told the gentleman what would happen. Right will conquer. They have seen fit to vilify us and I consider it my duty to get right up here and make this statement to this House and to the country. I would not make this statement until now. When those articles were written an election was near and they were written for the very purpose of denouncing me and my associates. Here is Saturday evening's paper: it comes right out flat-footed and goes on to say. You were in this House and you went out to give this to your paper to hand out to the public. Some of it was written here in the House. (Reads article). Why did you write it?

Because we tore that Bill to pieces you brought in this sectarian cry so as to draw the public's attention from the Bill. When I came into the House you were rushing the Bill through. We showed the public how absurd and unfair it was, and here is what you did to draw the attention of the public from it. When I used the word "cheatry" I had a definite meaning for it. I had in mind the bills paid the 'Daily Star' Office. Last year the 'Advocate' printed the Agricultural Report for $240. This year the 'Star' printed it and charged $850. Last year the 'Herald' was paid $425 for printing Customs Returns; this year the 'Star' is paid $1080 for the same work. Last year the 'Telegram' was paid $7.50 per thousand for printing Customs Forms; this year the 'Star' is paid $40 for the same. Last year the 'Herald' was paid $7.50 for Customs Forms; this year the 'Star' is paid $14 for the same work. Is not that cheatry? The 'Star' is cheating the people to the tune of 400 per cent. to 500 per cent. more for work than the other papers would do the work for. Now do you know what the word means? It is also true that when the bills were paid the results were not in. Is that good enough? Is that honesty?

Now with reference to "the two and a half"; the 'Star' says that I said: "The two and a half will not do you here." That is right exactly. When the Bay de Verde campaign was on I had two messages. The first message said that when Mr. Squires was speaking he said that the fish would be standardized by forty-two and a half. That was an error, and the second message said two and a half. If it was an insult to use the term then the men who first used it were the ones who were guilty and not those who, not knowing what it meant, repeated it.

The House of Assembly is being degraded day by day. Why all this? Isn't it done for a purpose? When anything like this is done in the House of Assembly it is done for a purpose. The purpose of this is to draw the public's attention from a worthless Bill. It is nothing but mean, contemptible, low-down poli-

tics, which does not commend itself to the smallest-minded man in the country. You have construed the facts to suit your own vile purposes.

MR. HIGGINS:—"He who gives to the poor lends to the Lord" but the man who votes himself an increase and refuses to listen to the plea of the widow and the orphan is the worst kind of offender against all that is charitable and all that is good. Instead of squandering money the way we are doing, let us say we are going to take some of this surplus and, after providing for ourselves first of course, and then having looked after the members of the Upper House, we will last of all see that we won't wrong the poor creatures who can't speak for themselves, the little children who have no votes and the poor bed-ridden old age pensioner, and I do it in no partisan spirit when I remind the gentlemen on the other side that we should not go out of here and have it to say that we voted ourselves an increase but did nothing for the aged and the poor. Do you not think that now you have started off on your voyage it would be more to your credit if you started it well by increasing this vote. Let the Leader of the Government say "yes, go back to your people and tell them that we have doubled this vote." Take the cases of these people, there must be hundreds of them in every district, looking forward to the coming of the quarterly dole that they might get a bit to eat. Think of the worn-out woman whose husband has been taken from her while engaged in the industry that has made this country; think of the wan little face of the poor half-starved child. Think of these, gentlemen, and ask yourselves if you can go out without lifting hand or voice in their behalf. I am quite certain that if hon. members on the other side thought seriously of this aspect of the case they would not be a party to passing this vote as it stands. Let me think that in spite of all the times we have been called hooligans and other things on this side of the House, there is one plane on which we can be all united. Think of all those who have gone down to their death in this country who did more than anyone here to make this a place fit to live in and ask yourselves can you find it in your hearts to be utterly blind to the wants and sufferings of their dependents. May we not hope that this matter will be taken up and something done before this vote goes through.

MR. BENNETT:—Mr. Chairman, just a word in corroboration of what has been said by Sir Michael Cashin and Mr. Moore with regard to conditions on the Southern Shore. I went thru the district myself and the statements made by these gentlemen are in no way exaggerated. The position is a terrible one. Houses, crops fish ing gear have been destroyed and the whole place is in ruins. The beautiful homes of a few days ago, many of which have such pleasant recollections for some of us, are now nothing but a blackened mass of ruins and I hope the Government will send a competent man there without loss of time to see what can be done to relieve the awful situation.

I want to express my appreciation of the Colonial Secretary for the explanation he has given the House of this vote. As I intimated, when the head of the Department came down with an explantion of the various increases, etc., it would facilitate matters considerably and he has like the Hon. Minister of Justice and the Hon. Minister of Fisheries given us that explanation, but I must say, like my hon. friend Mr. Higgins, that the fact of there being no increase for the

widows and old age pensioners is deplorable. I think when the commission was appointed that not alone was it the intention to have the salaries of the judges and similar high officials enquired into with a view to arranging for increases, but it was meant to cover the cases of the smaller officials and the poor as well, but the small official has been left out in the cold, while the higher ones have been placed on a par with those of the Upper Provinces of Canada. Now what applies to the higher officials as regards the necessity for an increase applies more emphatically to the smaller man and certainly to the relief of the poor. The purchasing power of money is not half what it was a few years ago, but still they are expected to get along on the same miserable dole they got then, and I think the plea so ably put forward by Mr. Higgins is one the Government might well hearken to. The Old Age Pension was introduced by Sir Edward Morris but at that time people thought it was going to be altogether impracticable, but nothing was ever more popular and the necessity for an increase in this grant now cannot be too strongly emphasized. There is one vote going through here which seems to me to be very large. That is $65,000 for smallpox. Now this may not require $5,000, but if the vote is put through as it is the amount will be spent. Of course, it is impossible to estimate what the danger of an outbreak may be and for that reason I think the amount was always voted on Executive responsibility.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—Other infectious diseases will come under that vote.

MR. BENNETT:—I would suggest that it be put in that way.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—We will make it to read smallpox and other infectious diseases.

MR. BENNETT:—That might not be enough, but that is easily remedied As the other votes seem to be all right I think the totals might be read.

MR. MOORE:—Mr. Chairman, while we are on the vote for Public Charities, permit me to join with my colleague, Sir Michael Cashin, in pleading for assistance for the sufferers on the Southern Shore. The picture painted by Sir Michael as a result of his visit there was not exaggerated. I went out as far as Tor's Cove and I saw for myself the havoc wrought by the forest fires in that section. At Mobile there is the most indescribable suffering. The people who have lost their all were there sitting on the road-side. They had taken their belongings from their houses when the fire threatened them and put them in the stages, but these were also destroyed, and with them their salt and gear and in fact everything they were owners of. I brought back a full report, and if the Government sent a man out there something might be done and should be done to relieve the sufferings. I hope no time will be lost in taking the necessary steps to have the matter attended to.

MONDAY, July 5th, 1920

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

William Henry Cave, Esq., duly elected member for the district of Bay de Verde, having been duly sworn by His Excellency's Commissioners, was introduced to the House by Hon. the Prime Minister and Hon. Minister of Justice, and thereafter took his seat.

MON. MINISTER OF EDUCATION:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the inhabitants of Spaniard's Bay asking for some modification of the present Prohibition Act.

MR. SCAMMELL:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the

residents of the Straits of Belle Isle on the subject of telegraph communication.

Mr. Higgins—Mr. Speaker: May I present a petition from the residents of Nagle's Hill, St. John's East, that is entitled to some consideration for two reasons: first, because it is bound to receive support, particularly from the Department of Agriculture, and secondly, that the amount asked for is very small. The petitioners ask for the opening up of roads. A considerable number of families have come there within the past few years and erected homes and started to develop farms and which reflects great credit on their industry. I think that the conditions under which we live that the amount asked for here is very small indeed, and, I feel sure, that the Minister of Public Works will give it his hearty endorsation and to whom I commend this petition. For his information I might say that this class of man whose name is signed to this petition is not the class of man whose name is usually found in petitions asking for personal favors. They represent men who stand for public improvements for the public benefit. I bespeak the sympathetic support of that department towards this petition.

Hon. Minister of Education: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill relating to Education.

Hon. the Prime Minister: Mr. Speaker—I give notice that I will on Wednesday next move the suspension of the Rules of the House in relation to all business then before the House and thereafter to come before the House.

Mr. Higgins: Might I ask if it is possible to have printed copies of the Education Bill before the Second Reading?

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—We are making an effort to have them ready for distribution on First Reading.

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—The Civil Service report to which the honorable member for Placentia refers was tabled by the Rt. Hon. Sir Edward Morris in the year of 1909 and appears in the journals of the House for that year.

Hon. Minister of Education gave notice that he would on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Education Act.

Mr. Walsh asked the Hon. the Colonial Secretary to lay on the table of the House a copy of the Report of the Civil Service Commission from a denominational stand-point issued in 1908.

Hon. the Prime Minister gave notice that he would on Wednesday next move the Suspension of the Rules of the House respecting all business now before the House or to come before it.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain Resolutions which were read a first time as follows—

Legislation	$ 77,358.12
Public Charities	931,299.71
Lighthouses, Blockhouses	210,771.39

M. WALSH:—Then we have the road from Placentia proper to Little Placentia, a distance of eight miles. The original grant for this was $400 and now it is $480. This is the only thoroughfare and for the reason I stated before ,namely the cost of labor, &c., it is impossible to keep this road up. Then we come to the road from Placentia to Cape Shore, and perhaps this one of the most important roads in the whole Island. There is no coastal service or railroad and the people are absolutely dependent on this particular road for communication with other places. And I wish to point out that on many occasions

they are called upon to contribute dollar for dollar as the men in Bonavista Bay. The people there have the railroad at their disposal and many other districts have the facilities of the rail road. I think it is unfair that a substantial amount of money is not voted to build a substantial road for those people. In the early part of the session my collague, Mr. Sinnott, presented a petition which was largely signed, having the signatures of all the people of this section of the community, on the same subject. Along that wild shore there is no safe harbor for forty miles for a vessel to harbor in during stormy weather, and the products of the rsidents have to some times remain over winter for the want of conveyance. There were scores of people there who were unable to market their catch of fish. There are numerous cases where they had their fish on their hands and lost thousands of dollars. I went down to the office of the Hon. Minister of Marine & Fisheries and pointed out to him the and he admitted they were being robbed of $3.00 per quintal on their fish. injustice being done to these people If they had been able to sell it at the proper time they would have got $15 pr quintal for it. It had to be held over the winter and then when they brought it down here in the spring they only got -6.00 per quintal for it. And thse conditions, judging from the Estimates are to remain the same as they are. I have no hope for the granting of the pleadings of my late colleagues Mr. Devereux and Mr. Morris. I also pleaded on numerous occasions for special consideration to be given to the special and extraordinary conditions existing in this part of the country. I had hoped for the facility of coastal communication for this part of the country but I am informed by the leader of the House in reply to the question which I asked that for the present no change is to be made in the coastal service as regards this part of the coast. I am sorry to hear this pronouncement and I am sure the people concerned are much more disappointed. Apparently their interests are not to be considered. I hope the reason for this lack of consideration on behalf of these people is not in the same category as the other discriminations that have been handed out because of the fact that Placentia and St. Mary's did not subscribe to the banner of the Liberal-Reform Party. I think we are entitled to this consideration. It is our just right. If they are not to be afforded coastal facilities surely it is not unreasonable to ask on behalf of those thousands of people who contribute by their labour and industry to make up the salaries of those in this House and who contribute to the upkeep of the public institutions just as much as the fishermen of the North. I say I trust the Government will take into consideration the extraordinary conditions prevailing in this section of the country and if it is impossible to grant the coastal facilities for the side of the Bay from Cape Shore to Placentia, I hope it will not be impossible to vote a substantial sum before the Estimates are passed so that a motor road will then be built at or along the Cape Shore. If this road is built the extraordinary conditions existing last winter will not be experienced this winter. The enterprising people there will certainly be able to supply the motor lorries if the Government will just show its sympathy in a practical way. You ought to vote a sufficient amount to build this important road. Another main line road is the one from Trepassey to St. Shotts, distance being fifty-eight miles and the grant is $420.00. This is not sufficient to keep half of the road

in repair and if the Government is not able to grant a substantial special amount to be disposed of by the Department, this road, over which many people have to travel many times will certainly go in disrepair quickly. Then there is the road from Holyrood to St. Mary's, a distance of 28 miles, and the grant is $240.00. Then from Riverhead to Mall Ball, $96.00. Salmonier to St. Mary's the amount is $840.00. These three last mentioned votes for the Main Line roads are on the Southside of Placentia Bay. I had hoped that we would have railway extension before now. When I went as a party standard bearer of Sir Edward Morris, the People's Party, in 1913, I went there because Sir Edward and his associates pledged themselves for the railway extension, but unfortunately the year after, 1914, the war broke out and the people of St. Mary's and Placentia were not so unreasonable as to expect during the period of the war any large expenditure of money from the public coffers and the representatives did not press the Government during the war; and now as the war is over and it is the proper time for the problem of railway extension, I have no doubt that it will be considered in this House. I have seen during the present session of the House important petitions presented by representatives of the important sections of the Island asking for the extension of the railroad, and I sympathise with them and their constituents who sent the petitions to the House, and I want to place myself on record to this effect, that at whatever time these matters petitioned for come before the House, that is, matters of railway extension, I will give them my warmest support and I will expect in return for that support the support of these gentlemen for a similar request in the same matter which has been before this House before and perhaps is the prior of all those relative to the question. It is absolutely unnecessary for me to point out that a railroad down thru' the Salmonier Valley, tapping St. Mary's Bay, would open up some of the most fertile sections of the Island for agriculture, and I venture to predict that a branch railway through St. Mary's Bay would be conducted on a paying basis, and I hope that later in the session this problem will be tackled. The vote for the Western Shore road was $300 and is now $360. I do not want to lay any blame on the present Administration for this small grant. This small amount has been passing the House for the past fifty years. But I want to point out to the Committee the ridiculousness of this vote because this road is fifty miles long and the amount of the vote is only $360. No part of this is assigned for any particular road. To make this road fit for foot passengers, not to speak of any other form of conveyance, the sum of two thousand dollars is required. And for this reason I have had on all occasions to plead with the Government and had to work overtime to get that amount allocated and that justice would be done to the people of this section. I would like if the Government would see its way clear to apportion some of the surplus left it by the late Administration. We can increase our own stipends so we ought to consider the whole people. If our hearts are so hard as not to harken to the cry of the widow and orphan or the old age pensioner, let us at any rate eliminate some of the hardships experienced by those who use the roads in my district and let us vote some of that surplus for the improvements of the roads. Maybe some of those highways do not concern you people here. You can take your motor

cars out with your chauffeurs to drive them and go where you like here in St. John's. You have no occasion to use the roads I am dealing with. No consideration is shown for the comfort of those who travel over these roads. There are numerous roads in Placentia and St. Mary's not yet completed. Last year I decided to become a Cashin candidate and had a consultation with the other gentlemen who were to be my colleagues and as there is by statute a sum of money to be allocated for the opening up of new roads, we considered this, and we then knew that the road between Peter's River and St. Shotts was only a cow path, and this was the subject of the first allocation, and to start with $2,000 was got for this particular road. This sum was spent judiciously and it was inadequate to open up this road. Another important section is down in the bottom of Placentia Bay, where the Railway should run thereby tapping many different settlements. During the last sesion of the House a petition was presented through me on this subject and it was signed by Rev. Short, Rev. Cacciola and Rev. Ward, and all the residents of the bottom of the Bay. This petition requested a road, and $500 was recommended and the sum of $2,000 was really required. Reliable men had the spending of that sum. I have letters in my possession from these Rev. gentlemen asking that a like amount be granted. In the case of emergncy loss of life may result. I remember one time Rev. Cacciola went on a sick call and when he got off the train he got lost in the woods, and from the exposure resulting he was in hospital here for months when he lost some of his limbs. If something is done along these lines I will be only too glad to give any information to the Minister of Public Works. I will be thankful for the due consideration which I hope the Government will give this matter.

MR. MacDONNELL:—I notice that evening a remark was made by the Prime Minister that in some special cases an additional may be made, and in view of this I wish to state that the main line roads in St. George's are under extraordinary conditions, and the Prime Minister admitted that fact and I am hoping that the Minister of Public Works will see that special allocation is made for these roads. We need more than what is given per capita elsewhere. The roads are new and they require better treatment than on a per capita basis. On page 102 of the Estimates there is the amount of $400 for the road at Grand River from the north to the south side. In the early part of the session I presented a petition asking that a motor be installed in the boat operating on the Grand River for the past ten years. It is a large scow, and this scow takes all the traffic from the north to the south side. I would like to know if the Government intends to grant the prayer of that petition. When the tide is strong and he weather is stormy there is a danger of losing many lives.

THE HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—I have referred it to the Executive through the Department of the Colonial Secretary. I could not say what has been done with it.

THE HON. THE COLONIAL SECRETARY:—I have not yet seen the petition.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works how much money voted for Public Works in the District of Ferryland is being allocated, how it is being sent out, and to whom?

THE HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—It has not been sent out yet.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—I would like to know something about the

Main Line Grants. The whole main line requires immediiate attention. I would also like to know why some of the Boards up there were dismissed and others appointed by the Governor in Council. I would like to be inform ed why this was done. They were elected a year ago at the same time that other Boards were elected thruout this Island. What is the reason for the dismissal of the Board at Witless Bay while the Board at ———— has been retained. I would like to know whether any instructions have gone out from the Department to have bridges replaced for those that were burned down?

THE HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—All bridges of which we had instructions as being burned, have been ordered to be replaced.

THE HON. MINISTER POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS:—Mr. Chairman, if there are any questions regarding this Department of Postal Telegraphs, I shall be glad to answer them as we come along to them.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Mr. Chair man, I would like to ask the Hon. Minister why the salary of the De puty Minister is placed at $3,000 whilst other Deputies are getting $3,600? Mr. LeMessurier is, I think, an old servant, spent the greater part of his life in this Department. I un derstand that he has no politics but attends to the business of his Depart ment solely. The Commission made no such recommendation with regard to him. Take the Superintendent of the Money Order Department. His salary has been raised from $1500 to -2160, whilst Mr. Kinsella's salary is only raised from $1260 to $1644. Mr. Kinsella is Superintendent of the Par cel Post Department and there is no reason why he should not be paid the same amount. Is this the recommend ation of the Commission?

THE HON. MINISTER POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS:—Mr. Chairman, that is the amount put down by the Com mission for the Superintendent of the Parcel Post Department. As to the Superintendent of the Money Order Department, his salary was raised on Executive authority. The head of the Department wrote the Executive ex plaining that there were three posi tions paid the same salary, but the Superintendent of the Money Order De partment and the Superintendent of the Parcel Post Department were nev er on the same basis. I did the very best I could and got every cent pos sible for the officials of the Depart ment.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Mr. Chair man. Mr. Kinsella has been in the service for forty years and there is no reason why his vote should be placed at $1644 while the Superintendent of the Money Order Department is put down at $2160. I certainly do not think that Mr. Kinsella is paid enough.

MINISTER OF POSTS AND TELE GRAPHS:—Mr. Chairman, if he were to be retired the salary of the new ap pointee would be much lower. I am trying to give them every cent pos sible.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Mr. Chair man, I want the Minister to put these two gentlemen on the same basis. There must be some political reason for this great difference. He has ad mitted just now that it was done on Executive authority. There is no satisfactory explanation given for the difference in salaries. The salaries are placed there and that is all the explanation that seems to be given us.

HON. MINISTER POSTS AND TELE GRAPHS:—Mr. Chairman, of course I appreciate the feeling of the Opposi tion, who are trying to give the impres sion that their hearts are bleeding for the Civil Servants; but this condition has existed for years. It is not a new thing for Civil Servants to be asking for an increase. The Superintendent

of Registration is in the same position with others in this regard.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Why not put him on the same basis as Mr. Milley?

HON. MINISTER POSTS AND TELE GRAPHS:—I will be honest enough to say that two or three persons are being considered, but at the present time I don't know who is going there.

MR. HIGGINS:—It is possible in spite of yourself that the man may be put there that you wouldn't want put there. The Minister has admitted the importance of his department, and in the light of the inconsistent way in which the salaries have been made up and where the Minister says he is going independently of the Government, I think it would be wise to have this injustice to Mr. Kinsella remedied.

HON. MINISTER POSTS AND TELE GRAPHS:—The nominating of a man and granting him a position make all the difference in the world.

MR. HIGGINS:—You have certainly been interested in him and why not go and get his salary.

HON. MINISTER POSTS AND TELE GRAPHS:—That may not be quite so easy.

MR. HIGGINS:—You are the man who recommends that a certain salary be paid. How does the Minister of Finance or the Colonial Secretary know what he should be paid. If you come out flat and say this man is to be paid a certain salary, it would be a far better exhibition of independence.

HON. MINISTER POSTS AND TELE GRAPHS:—I am not in the happy position to break up a government over a man's salary.

MR. HIGGINS:—Well now, will you give away a little secret? Did you try as hard to secure an increase for Mr. Kinsella as you did for Mr. Milley? Or, perhaps I will put it this way. Did you try as hard to get an increase for him as you did for Mr. LeMessurier? You tried hard, but not very hard. You are all influenced when it comes to looking after the big men. Mr. Kinsella is a poor man, wears an old shabby hat, been wearing the same for the past forty years if I don't mistake. Well, I am disappointed. Now we will wait till we see how Dr. Barnes looks after his department. You will find some fancy salaries there. I think that you ought to look after Mr. Kinsella, he's going to die soon. You won't have to give it to him for long.

MR. BENNETT:—In making some observations on the Estimates I take the position that the civil servants are not receiving the consideration of the Government. I think that grave discrimination is apparent. The Supt. of Posts and Telegraphs, Mr. Stott, has been increased to $2160. Mr. Stott has given good service and no doubt is deserving of the increase, but why discriminate against Mr. Kinsella. He is an old man in the service and spent his entire life in the service of Newfoundland, and why he has not received the same consideration as others I am at a loss to know. He may not be as young and as active as other officials, but if he can't do the work, give him a pension. It is not to the good of any government that their old and faithful servants are to be discriminated against.

MR. WALSH:—I think that it almost a waste of time and exertion on the part of the representatives of the Opposition to get up and make objection to the passage of any legislation in this House. It has been a set policy with this Government that the salary of Mr. Milley is justified according to the opinion of the Minister, and if it is the policy of the Government to repay any public servant for being a political supporter then I have no fault to find. Any member

of the civil service who has been blowing the Squires trumpet will get his salary increased, but any man who has dared to disagree with his policy must be prepared for the axe. There's a little chap DeLacey in St. John's West, who has given his brother as a family contribution to the war and whose body now lies over there in the battlefields of France, and who was not eligible himself to go, and because he dared give public expression to his views was dismissed from his position in the Custom House. If he had given you his support he would have been handsomely rewarded. This is not keeping with the standard you are suposed to have raised in this House. You have termed yourselves the Liberal Reform Party. I think it is sheer nonsense and waste of time to talk to the members on the other side of the House. All we get is sincere replies. A man who has been 40 years in the service of his country has been practically ignored, but the man who has not spent one quarter of that time in a civil position, is recognized. The Minister must admit that Mr. Kinsella is a good man and the discrimination is quite apparent. I want to place myself on record this afternoon to publicly denounce this outrage.

MR. FOX:—Might I draw the attention of the Minister to the necessity of putting a telegraph line from Cape Anguille to Codroy. I have been asked by Mr. MacDonnell, who is absent this afternoon, to draw your attention to this. The district to be covered is only three miles. There is no post or telegraph office at Cape Anguille, and the same applies to Doyle's and South Branch. I would like to endorse all that has been said by the hon. members in reference to Mr. Kinsella, and I realize the discrimination that has been practised.

MR. BENNETT:—Why increase the vote of the Sub-Collector at Kelligrews from $375 to $750; for what reason?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—We dispensed with the official at Topsail, and we have one man looking after the two places now.

MR. HIGGINS:—Is that Charles Hynes?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—Yes.

MR. HIGGINS:—This is the man who petitioned against Dr. Jones; he is worth it all right, to the Government. A Government Customs official named DeLacey was dismissed, and it is unfortunate, unfortunate in the sense that he had not the power of foresight that Charles Hynes had up in Kelligrews. DeLacey's mistake was that he did not know how to keep his mouth shut during the election period. I did not have the pleasure of meeting this man Hynes in court, after he had filed the petition against Dr. Jones, but I do know that a week after he performed that ceremony he was appointed to a position in the Customs, and a man named Tilley, who already held that post, was dismissed. It is really the irony of fate in the light of the justification made as to the honesty of the Government in making the increases in salaries. It is an unfortunate coincidence that we should learn at this stage that the man who replaced Tilley was this man Hynes, who also, so far as other men were concerned, got his salary in his new job raised from $375 to $750, this being the purchase price of his loyalty. I hope that the Government will be big enough to rectify the wrong done DeLacey. DeLacey's case is pitiable for a variety of reasons. First of all he is weak physically, as the Minister of Finance knows, and is only capable of doing the lightest kind of work. He has two brothers who went overseas and fought; one who was badly wounded has since recovered and is now driving an ex-

press waggon; and this young man in question has been doing his best to try and keep the home of his parents' going. He is today doing nothing. He was fired out for the reason that he saw fit to open his mouth in the West End bye-election. This is a frightfully unfortunate circumstance in view of the fact that an able-bodied man gets his salary doubled for serving the party. This unfortunate boy DeLacey is today a physical wreck. Surely this is a just reminder of the rottenness of state control and state service. I do not know this man Hynes, I never met him. His only credential for the position he got and for replacing the man Tilley that was dismissed, is that he used his judgment to the advantage of the party and later he got his salary doubled. DeLacey does not know that I am making this appeal for him to-night, I would like to emphasize, but surely the Minister will have the memorial service of yesterday in mind and think of poor DeLacey's brothers, who fought for us, and try and take the lesson of Christian charity therefrom, and try if you can't re-instate this unfortunate boy who could not harm any party if he tried. Probably, though, he exercised his judgment best; who knows the wisdom of his judgment; who knows what has happened since the return to power of the Government and since, and who knows after looking at these Estimates, but that the judgment of this poor, innocent and unfortunate boy DeLacey, if it had prevailed, that things would be in a much better state generally? Time alone will tell. Might I again ask the Minister if he would voluntarily undertake and make a job for this boy. It is no more to make a job for him than it is to make a job for Mr. George Shea in the Upper House at $500 a year. I think it would be more fitting and more commendable to make a job for DeLacey, as a tribute to what his brothers fought and did for you and me.

MR. HIGGINS:—I understand that there is no substantial allocation for this vote. The main line grants throughout the entire country are of necessity too small. The cost of material and the upkeep of them have become so advanced that it is impossible to keep them in shape for the amount voted. The 20 per cent increase is not commensurate with the rate of pay of the man who works on the road, or with the cost of the different materials. I think it is a pity that the Government did not embark upon a policy on the lines that they had promised. I think all will subscribe to the principle that we all like to have our roads in a decent condition. Well, that being so, why take the old stock votes that have been there for so long a time, and particularly because of the heavier class of vehicles that go over the roads at the present time causing more increased expenditure to keep them in a respectable state of repair. I think we ought to allocate a substantial amount to be distributed among the different districts, as required. The roads, as outlined here, do not include many roads that should be given the benefit of main line grants and which are not. Take the road to Logy Bay and Outer Cove. It is a very popular drive over that road and nine tenths of the people who frequent it do not belong to the outport places mentioned. In other words, this road is for the general benefit of the community. Now there is no amount voted for that road. The first time for years that this road was given any attention worth while was last year when there was a general allocation all over the country. I regret that the Government is not going to allocate a special grant this year, because personally I believe with the notion that prevails elsewhere that one can-

not spend too much on public highways. I again regret that no further advance is made, in the light of the fact that we committed ourselves to the principle of road-making when the Motor Association Bill was before the House. I think I might avail of this opportunity of mentioning to the Minister of Public Works that he has now got an opportunity of displaying some of those re-organizing powers. You know we used to hear a considerable amount of abusive comment in the past on how road monies in the past were allocated. I trust that the Minister will see that some of the reforms, so long expected, will go into effect. However, I am afraid that the same old method will be fallen into and I am afraid that somebody's personal friends in St. John's East will not give as much satisfaction as the gentlemen they replaced. These gentlemen who have been shifted for no reason whatever except that they were not friendly disposed to the party in power, did competent work in the past. I trust that the Minister of Pub lic Works will not endorse too much of that kind of method.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—I do know that there have been a couple of changes, but not more than a half dozen.

MR. HIGGINS:—I can give you a whole list of them.

MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—The same road inspector is there and I have instructed him not to employ any incapable help; also I told him that I would stand by him in giving every man who worked on the roads to understand that he had to give good results. Any changes made to the disadvantage of the roads have not been made at my recommendation.

MR. HIGGINS:—Whatever changes were made are not going to affect me any how, and are not going to hurt me at all, in fact the new appointees are friends of mine; but apparently someone has taken charge of your department.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Chairman, I must say that I feel disappointed at the statement of the Prime Minister in regard to the upkeep of the roads. However, I trust that when the vote whatever it is, will be distributed, that the District of Placentia and St. Mary's will not be forgotten. In com mon with certain other sections of the country, the storm that raged last Fall played havoc with parts of my district also, and I hope that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will see his way clear to hand out special grants to make good the damage done. With regard to main lines generally throughout the country, I do not think that it is necessary for us to point out that the grant is altogether inadequate to keep roads in decent condition when we consider that the cost of labor and materials have gone up two hundred per cent. Where the grant for 12 miles of a road from the half-way house in Holyrood was $500 is now increased to $600; from Placentia to Hurley's Bridge, a distance of 33 miles, the vote is $400. I hope that the Government in conjunction with the Motor Association, will see their way clear to span the bridge to Colinet River. $160 is vote for the road from Hurley's Bridge to Salmonier, a road that is used by all the people in St. Mary's Bay, and it is only by getting special grants every year that we have been able to keep these roads in any kind of half decent condition whatever for traffic. I think we should make provision so as we would not be depending on special grants from year to year.

MR. HIGGINS:—You are making jobs galore under the new Department. Why not make DeLacey Deputy Minister of Education and give him $2750 a year and he will fulfill the position just as well as any other person you will put there. I appeal

to the good sense and kindly spirit of the Minister of Finance. God knows he wants the job.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—In reply to the hon. member as regards DeLacey, he well knows that DeLacey was not alone obnoxious in his position but also obnoxious towards the general public doing business at the Railway Station.

MR. HIGGINS:—In fact the man is of indifferent health and it was such as he was fired and the big gun who could fight was all right. We recognize the foolish ones voted for us.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—After the general election I had no intimation or desire to remove DeLacey and he looked upon the taking of an active part in the election as an act of gratitude to those who placed him in his position, but when the bye-election came off he was pointed out to us as being very obnoxious around the Railway Station. He made it a point of going to the newspapers which supported the late government and distributing them around among his friends. Even after that I did not take the chap serious and he came down to my office to see about his job and asked if it was the intention to dismiss him, and I told him no and the only way to get clear of him was to dismiss him, which I did As to putting him back, I have nothing against him and if I can do it I will. The other day other parties approached me on the same matter. As regards the Kelligrews matter the official who does the work there also does the work for Topsail under the present Estimates. Mr. Roche was the holder of the job at Topsail and he died and as we thought it unnecessary to have a customs official at Topsail we appointed the official at Kelligrews to do the two works and accordingly paid him twice as much, which is only reasonable.

MR. BENNETT:—I am very grateful to the Minister of Finance for the information in the matter and as one of those who are concerned with the district may say as far as I am concerned he is one that I do not take seriously. . I do support the request that some work be given him. The late Government through a continual pressing on his part and knowing that he was in hard luck gave him a job. I discouraged him from taking part in politics, but unfortunately for him he was endeavoring to show gratitude to those who placed him in his job and as far as possible tried to keep the late Government in power. He had two brothers over there and if I am not mistaken one of them paid the supreme sacrifice. His father is an old public servant being a letter-carrier for a long time and is one at the present moment. He is over seventy. And I am grateful to the Minister for the information he has given us in saying that he will do his best to have him reinstated in his job.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—I wish to explain this vote of fifty thousand dollars. Last year the vote was taken from the Marine and Fisheries Department. The vote is down in the usual form and instead of having it taken from that Department it is now put in the Customs Department. That is the better place for it.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—May I ask the Minister of Finance in reference to that vote of $3,500, is it true that the Customs officials last year got no clothes? I intended to put this on the Order Paper.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—For the information of the honorable gentleman I may say that the Military authorities had quite a lot of

serge on hand and we were arranging to take it over and during the last week asked for tenders as to the making up of the same.

MR. BENNETT:—Speaking on refunds on coal, there seems to be a lot of dissatisfaction as to the price we are paying for coal. I was informed yesterday that coal from Sydney to Halifax only costs at Halifax $12.00 per ton. Surely the difference in freight ought not bring around the difference in price there and here. I think the public will appreciate any information that may be forthcoming. Maybe the Minister of Shipping would enlighten us on the matter.

HON. MINISTER OF SHIPPING:—That seems to be a mistake. I do not think it can be sold at $12.00 at Halifax.

MR. BENNETT:—No, it is correct as far as I know. There is always an opinion prevailing here that there is a big rake off on coal. One dollar per ton is a big discrepancy. Did not the Dominion Company's Directors have interviews with the Government relative to supplying the country with coal and also with reference to the tax to be collected on the export of ore. I presume some information will be coming before the House closes in reference to the tax on the ore at Bell Island.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—With regard to the coal question the Government proposes to take action shortly and requests those who need it to store it early. We will be making arrangements for more coal than last year very shortly. I may say the matter is acute in Canada and the United States as well. At the present moment I hold in my hand two articles from the Montreal Star and they say that a controller is to be appointed to take charge of the coal and the Government is advocating the getting of the coal for here before the appointment of the controller and then we will not at least have any more difficulty than the past. According to these articles the industries there have not more than one week's supply in Canada and they often fear they are going to close. This has been brought to the attention of the Government and the Government is going to get all the coal it can and it is going to insist on the industrial centres here in St. John's storing the necessary coal. And by no means is it going to leave the matter till the winter season.

MR. BENNETT:—It is difficult for the ordinary person to store coal at the present price. They expect it to lower. The price is abnormal.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Well if they do they cannot expect the Government to come to their assistance.

MR. BENNETT:—With regard to Anthracite coal, the price now is $35.00. The Government I presume is interested in this matter.

HON. MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—The Public Works Department has issued advertisements asking for tenders for the different institutions supply of Anthracite.

MR. BENNETT:—But is it possible to get it? Is it procurable at Pittsburg? The cost of production has increased. There has been an enormous increase over the past price. Instead of the price being cheapened it is going up. If any information is possible it ought to be given to the public. If necessary we ought to send a man to Canada and get the information first hand.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—What is the position with regard to the Bell Island ore tax, I was not here when it was discussed?

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—The negotiations with the Company's representatives were partly finalized

and they have gone back to think it over. Nothing really was done.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—When do you propose collecting the ore tax from the Nova Scotia Company?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—Inspector O'Reilly has been negotiating with the Company.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN—:That will not do. The Dominion Steel Co. paid theirs. At the present time you are holding over the heads of the Dominion Steel Company an export duty of one dollar on ore. No reason why the Minister of Shipping cannot make arrangements for all the coal we need at the present time. The House has been open three months and nothing has been done in reference to this one dollar tax and now we are told that next year we will have more retroactive legislation. Large steamers go to Sydney and then are unable to get cargoes. The same with vessels. The Company owes you in the vicinity of a quarter of a million dollars for taxes. It is in accordance with the history of this session. Nothing important has been done. Not one act on the statute books of any importance. The Dominion Steel paid their taxes voluntary and there is no reason why the same should not be the policy of the Government with regard to the Nova Scotia Steel Co. The coal situation will be the same as it was last fall. The same applies to the railroad. The same old road exists to-day. It is a ridiculous position for the Government to be in.

MR. BENNETT:—When I was over in Bay de Verde I saw coal landed there at Freshwater on the wharf and I asked the man who was handling it what he paid for it and he said he gave $5.70 per car load and a car load meant about fourteen hundred. In other words he was getting it for about seven dollars and fifty per ton. Of course he was an employee of the Company but I do not see why the difference in price is so great between the cost at Bell Island and the cost in St. John's.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Chairman, it is a fact that down at Portugal Cove they are getting their coal $6 to $7 a ton cheaper than we are. It is extraordinary that we have here two statements of conditions. First, there is the statement at Halifax, the price of coal there. Then there is the statement as to the price at which employees get it at Bell Island. It seems that when the Newfoundland order comes in the price of coal goes up. I strongly support the suggestion of the Leader of the Opposition that the Minister of Shipping be immediately sent up and see that this matter is thoroughly looked into. The company owes us a large amount as taxes in spite of the fact that the other Company has paid its taxes. There is no reason why the taxes of the Nova Scotia Steel & Coal Company should go unpaid any longer. On the other hand we have the Government's declared intention not to do anything in this matter for twelve months. It may have the effect of hampering operations on the Island. It is a pity that this matter cannot be attended to at once, but if the Government intends doing as little as possible before the House closes, and if they intend bringing in retroactive legislation again next year, nothing will be done in this matter. If the Government intends holding this legislation over their heads this is the proper time to get the coal. They have the coal up there and we want it; we have the ore down here and they want it. We will endorse sending the Minister of Shipping up there and giving him all the powers of an ambassador, so that we may get cheaper coal. With their business tax still unsettled, and the Companies merger unsettled, I think they will be business-like enough to see that

it will be wise to be a little generous toward us . Unless some aggressive, strong position is taken at once it will be a bad position for us.

MR. MOORE:—Mr. Chairman, I strongly support the arguments advanced by the members of St. John's West and St. John's East. It seems a strong statement for the member to make that the people in Freshwater, Bay de Verde, can get coal for $8.00, we have to pay $12.00 extra in St. John's. Surely there is something wrong. The Minister of Shipping ought to be sent immediately to look into this matter. All the other Ministers are going away, and we can spare you also. Now is the time to deal with this question. We have the power in our own hands, and it is up to us to do something.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Chairman, there is just a word that I would like to say at this time. Not only have we the ore, but we have the coal as well. In my judgment we have abundance of coal in sections of the country, and I understand that the Government is negotiating with parties on the West Coast with respect to this. I think the Government would be well justified in handling this industry in a business-like way. I hope it is not another case of where a gentleman was recommended by someone in authority, but when the test came he was thoroughly lacking. I understand that the owners of that property on the West Coast have had very attractive offers from this Continent and from England. I understand that the Government stepped in and would not allow any proposition to be finalized. I hope the Government have gone into the matter with the idea of developing the local coal areas. I am heartily in accord with the suggestion to send up the Minister of Shipping to arrange for a supply of coal, and I hope that the activity will cover every section of the country so that every section will help toward the upkeep of the Shipping Department.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Chairman, I was going to explain that the total amount of the expenses of the Militia Department is made up different from last year.

MR. BENNETT:—Mr. Chairman, before the Committee rises in connection with this vote I would like to refer to an article in The Advocate of last Saturday. I think most of the honorable members have had an opportunity of reading this, and it surely reflects credit on the Hon. Minister.

Apart from one section of the article it might go unchallenged, and be accepted as authoritative. My attention was drawn to section 1, which deals with the fact that no attention was paid to the remains of men or their graves after the Armistice. The section reads: (Section read).

Now, sir, under the circumstances that is a very strong statement. I have no idea as to the time the Hon. Minister was in France, but it might be assumed that I was responsible for this criminal negligence. I am sure that such an order never came. As you will notice there is an ambiguity about Father Nangle's statement. As far as I am concerned I had no knowledge of any such request coming into the Militia Department. If there had, I would have given immediate instructions to have the work attended to, no matter what it cost. It may have been at the time when my successor, Mr. Hickman, held office. It surely was not during my time. If the O.C. in France thought it necessary that such work should be done, he had only to order same and see that it was accomplished without reference to the Minister of Militia. In fact he was the one that should do so. If the Hon. Minister or any other honorable member wishes to look up the records of the Militia Department he will find

them intact, and if there was such a request it ought to be found amongst the records. I felt that I ought to give this explanation in justice to myself.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—Mr. Chairman, it gives me very great pleasure to hear the denial from the hon. member for St. John's West in connection with the matter of the burial of our dead heroes in France. He, of course, feels the matter very seriously as I do and I am glad that he is in a position to-day to disclaim any responsibility for such a criminal neglect of duty. On going over the ground, we saw these bodies, we came across two first and took up one of the helmets from which we brushed away the dirt and saw the Newfoundland badge. Side by side with him was another. That was hard enough, but just a little distance away, on the corner of a knoll or mound, we found seven other bodies, some with their heads one way and some another. It was hard to think that these poor fellows had been lying there for three years and eight months. Major Nangle had gone over the ground and only a year ago Sir Wm. Lloyd and I had been there and must have been within forty yards of where we came across the bodies. Fr. Nangle said that the whole field had been thoroughly searched and this spot was only twenty-five feet away from where he found poor Frank Lind and young Clancey just a year before. Poor Clancey had a prayer-book in his hand by which Fr. Nangle identified him and he knew it was poor Lind's body by the papers that were found on it. I said to Major Nangle, "how is this thing possible, who has failed to do his duty in this matter?" He felt it very keenly and replied, I think his words were "Recommendations were made by the O.C. to the authorities in St. John's to have detachment of men kept back to search for and pick up the bodies of those who had fallen." When he said the O.C. had made the recommendations, I took it for granted that it was Major Bernard as I understand he was in command of the Battalion at the time. Since I came back, I published an item about the matter in the paper, and I endeavoured to find out if any request had come in. I asked several officers but I did not go to the Record Office, where, as Mr. Bennett suggests, it could no doubt be found if such a request had come in. However, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to hear from Mr. Bennett that he was not responsible for the grave dereliction of duty that resulted in these bodies being found where they were, and in the condition they were in when we came across them.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Chairman, before this vote goes thru, I want to make one more plea for an inspector of mines. We have lumber camp inspectors, marine inspectors, inspectors of roads and bridges, inspectors of marine works, herring and lobster inspectors and inspectors for every branch of industry no matter how insignificant except for what in my opinion is the most important of all, namely, mines. I have referred to the matter on many previous occasions and it is unnecessary for me to labor the question but I hope and trust that the Government will make some provision for a man to take up this very necessary work. They have made many new appointments and one more will not bankrupt the country. I hope the Prime Minister will take the matter up with the Minister of Agriculture and Mines without delay. There is no need to go outside for a suitable man for this work, you can get fifty men in this country who are fully competent to perform it, and if you are going to get a man, get one who will have the confidence of the working man, and moreover, one who is not a political heeler

and you must pay him a good salary so that he will not come under the influence or sway of any corporation. Numerous accidents are happening all the time, some of which, of course, cannot be helped or averted but there are others that could be if the proper care were exercised. My first visit after the office of Minister of Agriculture and Mines was to the mines of the Dominion Iron and Steel Co. and the Nova Scotia Co. at Bell Island, and the management of these plants were only too willing that I should inspect the mines and they afforded me every assistance possible in doing so. It may be asked by the members on the opposite side "Why didn't you appoint an inspector when you were there?" I didn't have the chance. I did not have time to bring into operation the ideas that I had in the back of my head in this regard. The Bell Island companies do all that is possible to safeguard the lives of the men working with them, but it is only natural to suppose that the men employed by these companies are going to do all they can to cut down expenses, and the making of provision for safeguarding life is not calculated to cut down but rather to add to expenses. The proper timbering of mines is most important and must be attended to by a fully qualified man as must also the other branches. Take the matter of explosives, for example, only by years of practical experience can a man become proficient in this and only by high wages can you hope to secure the services of such a man, and naturally if a company can get a cheaper man they are going to take the risk which his inexperience may entail and in order to overcome this sort of thing we must adopt the system that we have applied to our other industries. When the Minister of Marine and Fisheries came in here he had considerable experience in the seal fishery. He got to work and put a law on the Statute Book which eliminated at least some of the undesirable features in that industry. This mining industry is bound to play a prominent part in the future of this Colony. I have handed out these suggestions in no spirit of criticism but in an honest desire to see some good come out of them. Down in these mines I myself have gone as long as 12 months without seeing daylight. I have gone down before daybreak and come up at dark for 12 months and I know the conditions that exist there. I think that the man who goes down in the mines at Bell Island and breathes the foul air and dynamite smoke from one end of the year to the other that he is entitled to all the privileges that this House can throw at him.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—I may say that this matter has been taken up with Mr. Hall and that he will make a report.

MR. HIGGINS:—Following on the lines of Mr. Walsh's remarks and as evidence of the value of such a laudable idea the company over there has formed their own safety first committees. The heads of the different departments comprise the committee and they take turns in going round and have all the dangerous curves and overhanging rocks or ore remedied. It shows the company's desire to respond to any effort for the elimination of the dangers that are always there. The work in this connection is purely voluntary but there are times that it may be hampered on the grounds of expense. If there is a bad accident in the slope you can't get a man to go down there for several days after. What you do really want there is an independent government inspector who would be continually going over there and I know that such an appointment would be recognized and appreciated by the companies concerned.

MR. WALSH:—Not only Bell Island

but many other parts of the country are in a like position. In Sept. 1903 I was working at Pilley's Island and on Sept. 2nd a chap named Keefe went down into the mine at five o'clock in the morning and at seven o'clock he was brought to the surface having been killed instantly. I was with him at the time and received a broken arm and scratches that I carry to this day. If we had a competent inspector at that time this would not have happened. The affair was caused by incompetent help filling responsible positions. A charge of dynamite put in a hole that O'Keefe had drilled the day before was not fired when the other blasts went off. This hole was not noticed and was not connected with the result that O'Keefe and I who were working with the drill the day after struck the charge of dynamite and caused an explosion. When I came to myself I called for O'Keefe, he was dead and in pieces. I don't blame the government or past governments for this accident but we must prevent a recurrence of such as this for ever more. I am prepared that the government shall get full credit for such an appointment and such a man who will not be baulked in his duties.

MR. HIGGINS:—I would like to ask the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries in regard to the appointment of trade commissioners, how many have been appointed to the present time and where are they going to be placed?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—There will probably be one placed at Greece, Italy, Spain, there is one in Portugal now. There will be one at Brazil, West Indies, and Liverpool, and probably next year one at ————. There will also be one to follow Mr. Goodridge in South America.

MR. HIGGINS:—How will they be employed? Will they go over there for a number of years?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—Yes, if we will get good men we will probably send them over there for two or three years. The worst feature it is hard to get good men and to get them to stay at a place and there is also the matter of languages as well. A man in Europe who can speak French will get along alright. It is not hard to get a man for Brazil. I think that there will be about 10 men employed.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—There is only one section now and that is Education. We cannot touch that until the Bill is brought down.

Committee rises.

The said Resolutions being read a second time it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein and the said Resolutions were agreed to.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—In the Supplemental Supply there will be noted three items to which I might call attention, $5,000 paid Sir Michael Cashin; $10,000 paid Mr. A. B. Morine, and $2,500 paid myself. I have been informed that during my absence from town in connection with the Bay de Verde bye-election Sir Michael Cashin was pleased to attack me as having been paid the sum of $2,500, and, with his usual impudent insolence suggested that the money had been paid before. Sir Michael Cashin knew that his insinuation was false, but it is merely in line with that base contemptibleness of his which is written all over the records of the proceedings of the House. While in the District of

Bay de Verde my attention was called to an editorial in Sir Michael Cashin's chief supporting paper, the "Daily News." I immediately telegraphed a solicitor to institute libel proceedings, and that has been done. As the attack was made in the House, however, I felt that I should not let this opportunity pass without making reference thereto. The payment of $5,000 to Sir Michael Cashin was made to him for two visits paid by him to Canada and the United States in connection with the floation of loans, the payment agreed upon being $2,500 for each journey. The payment made to Mr. Morine consists of a fee of $5,000 paid him in connection with the Labrador Boundary. For this $5,000 he gave nothing, offered no advice, took no steps and did not spend any time in a study of the matter. The remaining sum of $5,000 consists of $1,000 or so which he paid himself for the purchase by himself as Attorney General of a remnant of his own law library. When he moved from his law office some years ago when he left Newfoundland intending presumably to take up residence in Canada he had a number of books that he considered it not worth his while to pack up to take away with him. He left these in his office in St. John's in charge of a solicitor who rented the offices after he vacated them. Mr. Morine returned to Newfoundland a short while ago and on becoming Attorney General had these books removed from his office to the Department of Justice, and as Attorney General bought them for his official office from himself as a private practitioner. That transaction was concurred in by Sir Michael Cashin, the other $3,000 or $4,000 representing special fees which were paid him for which value may or may not have been secured. Mr. Morine, it will be remembered, was an Independent Opposition member during the Lloyd Administration. When in the spring of 1919 friction arose between Sir Michael Cashin and Sir William Lloyd because Sir William Lloyd refused to assent to certain preposterous terms which Sir Michael was pressing on behalf of the Reid Newfoundland Company, the Reid Newfoundland Company and Sir Michael took the position that they were strong enough to smash the Government, and they were. Mr. Morine, who when Attorney General some years ago, made himself famous as being both Attorney General and legal adviser to the Reid Newfoundland Company, Government contractors, at the same time, who is to-day one of the Reid lawyers handling for the Reids important company business, joined Sir Michael Cashin, to whom up to that moment he had apparently been most aggressively opposed, and became Attorney General from April, 1919, to November, 1919, when the Cashin Administration was defeated and Mr. Morine lost his own seat in his own constituency of Bonavista, finding himself at the bottom of the poll of six candidates. Mr. Morine drew his salary as Attorney General and in addition thereto drew this sum of $10,000 for special services and old law books. It would not be for me to say that any such deal was made between Sir Michael Cashin and Mr. Morine as the subsequent facts indicate, but it is worthy of note that for the brief period of six months during which Mr. Morine was Attorney General he drew in addition to his salary as Attorney General a bonus of $10,000, $7,000 or $8,000 of which could not by any possible line of thought be regarded as earned. This same Sir Michael Cashin who paid this money to Mr. Morine and who himself accepted $5,000 for two visits to Canada in connection with loan matters is quite indignant, because I was paid for my services for visiting Ottawa in connection with the transfer of Newfoundland Shipping at

the same rate per journey as he was paid. Certainly logical reasoning has never been known to be in any way identified with the particular system, whatever it may be, with which his irregular and uncertain thinking processes are identified. Certainly Sir Michael Cashin's insinuation about my having been paid twice in this connection is absolutely false, and for the information of the House I will relate the circumstances of the whole transaction. In November, 1917, I was Colonial Secretary of the Morris National Administration. Sir Edward Morris was in England, and Dr. Lloyd, the Attorney General, now the Rt. Hon. Sir William Lloyd, was acting in his stead. At about eleven o'clock one morning Sir William Lloyd received a cable from Sir Edward Morris urging him to send some person to Ottawa to take up with the Canadian authorities the matter of the transportation by Canadian vessels of Newfoundland codfish to the European markets. The facts were that practically all Newfoundland owned vessels used in the fish carrying trade to the European markets were under Canadian registry. The message from Sir Edward Morris was to the effect that under a Canadian Order in Council no Canadian registered vessel was permitted to enter the war zone and if any such vessel did attempt a journey across the Atlantic the vessel and her cargo were liable to forfeiture. Under the circumstances in which Newfoundland fish shippers found themselves placed, that Order in Council destroyed every hope of marketing the 1917 catch of codfish. That was the month of November. Practically no codfish had been shipped across the Atlantic. Almost the entire year's catch was in Newfoundland awaiting transhipment, and with that Canadian Order in Council in existence there were no ships by which that fish could be forwarded. Fish in Newfoundland is of no more value than the rocks on our hills except in so far as it can be shipped abroad for sale. Newfoundland was consequently faced with absolute disaster. Immediately on the receipt of the message Sir William Lloyd telephoned the Reid Newfoundland Company asking them to hold their express which was due to leave that day at one o'clock until two o'clock that afternoon, and he summoned an emergency meeting of Council at his own office, the office of the Attorney General. Sir William Lloyd was in the chair. There were present Sir Michael Cashin, Sir John Crosbie, Mr. Hickman, myself and perhaps several other members of Council. I am not quite sure as to the other members who were there. Sir William Lloyd placed the position before Council, and asked for volunteers to go that day on the express and take the matter up with the Canadian authorities at Ottawa. No one would volunteer to undertake the work. Sir William Lloyd asked Mr. Hickman if he would go. Mr. Hickman refused saying that at that season of the year it was absolutely impossible for him to leave his business at such short notice. Other members of Council were not prepared to go. Finally Sir Mchael Cashin, then Minister of Finance and Customs, said that as nobody else would go and as I was Colonial Secretary, it was my duty to go. I demurred because it meant a very great sacrifice for me, without a minute's notice, in the month of November, to abandon my large law practice and hand over to other solicitors the important work which was in my office for attention. There was no client on Water Street who for the sum of $2,000 could have induced me to leave my office under these circumstances to go to Ottawa on a matter of business for him. However, the situation was serious. Newfoundland's interest had

to be looked after. It meant positive disaster if satisfactory arrangements could not be made. No other member of Council was prepared to make the sacrifice, and, being Colonial Secretary and ever prepared to undertake responsibilities which others desired to shirk, I said that I would go, provided the train was held up for another hour; that would be until three o'clock. I went back to the Colonial Secretary's office and disposed of one or two important matters and had all the outstanding business at the Colonial Secretary's office and my law office gathered together. I arranged with Mr. Le-Messurier, the Registrar of Newfoundland Shipping, to get together all the information on the points on which I required to be informed, and took my Secretary and went out on train at three o'clock. I got from Mr. Lemessurier when travelling across country all the information he could give and so far as it was possible attended to all outstanding matters; Mr. Le-Messurier and my secretary returning to town by a crossing train. It was only after I had started the journey that I realized that negotiations with the authorities in Canada would be difficult because general elections were then pending in Canada. I did not realize the great difficulty, however, in that regard until I arrived at Montreal, and found that all the Cabinet Ministers were in their constituencies, but fortunately the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Marine were offering themselves as candidates for Montreal constituencies. I got in touch with the Secretary of the Minister of Justice at Montreal, and had an interview with him after a political meeting which he held at Montreal, the interview being at his room at the Ritz Carlton Hotel at midnight. On the following day I visited the Committee Rooms of the Minister of Marine and discussed the matter with him in his committee rooms after a meeting which he had with his campaign organization. After I had done everything possible in Montreal I went to Ottawa and took the matter up with the Deputy Minister of Marine, Mr. A. Johnson, whom I found to be an exceedingly courteous and capable official. He gave sympathetic consideration to the case as I put it before him. I then found that it was absolutely impossible to hope to secure the attendance at Ottawa of a sufficient number of members of the Council to secure the passage of any Order in Council modifying the existing Order in spite of the fact that the Minister of Justice and Minister of Marine had both, with the abundant courtesy for which they are noted, offered to leave their constituencies in the heat of the election and go to Ottawa to attend a Cabinet meeting if such were found to be necessary. After discussing the matter very thoroughly I found that a meeting of the Cabinet was utterly impossible to secure, and entirely discourteous and unfair for me to suggest under the circumstances, I felt that there was a way by which the matter could be handled, namely, by an arrangement which could be made under the Ministerial authority of the Minister of Marine, and that was to release from Canadian Registry and have transferred to Newfoundland Registry all ships owned in Newfoundland. The Minister of Marine very courteously left his contest in Montreal and came to Ottawa for the day. There was a conference between the Minister, his Deputy, and myself, which lasted a considerable portion of the forenoon and lunch hour and a large part of the afternoon. The position was fully discussed, and before I left the Department of Marine that afternoon a cable was sent by the Deputy Minister of Marine to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries of

Newfoundland, and also a cable sent by him to the Registrar of Shipping, St. John's, putting into effect the program which I had laid before them and to which they had so courteously agreed. In the meanwhile I had telegraphed Sir William Lloyd laying before him the position as I saw it. I had received a reply saying that it would be necessary for him to submit the proposition to Council for consideration, and after a meeting of Council he would telegraph me instructions. I had waited for a day. No reply had been received. It was essential that the arrangement should be closed immediately, and I closed the arrangement entirely on my own responsibility without waiting for the authority of Council, as I felt that was a matter of vital importance, that that was the very best that could be done, that that met the situation fully and that it had to be closed that day before the Minister of Marine went back to his constituency. I remained in Ottawa in connection with this business and did not leave Ottawa until I received a wire from the Acting Prime Minister authorizing me on behalf of the Government of Newfoundland to make the arrangements, which, as a matter of fact, I had made two or three days previously. Since Newfoundland has been sending representatives abroad to handle business transactions I venture to say that there has not been a case in which such important diplomatic negotiations as between countries have been handled more expeditiously and with greater success. I was absent from Newfoundland between three and four weeks in all. I returned early in December. The political condition was cloudy. There was no meeting of the Executive Council called for general business from the time I got back to the dissolution of the Government, but on the 14th of December there was a formal meeting for the confirmation of minutes at Government House. We all then had reason to believe that Sir Edward Morris was retiring at the end of the year and that he would be advising His Excellency the Governor to call upon Dr. Lloyd to form a Ministry. It was also considered highly probable that I would be declining to accept office in that Ministry, but Sir William Lloyd, with the courtesy and honor for which his private, professional and political career is so well known, wrote out at Government House in the presence of His Excellency the Governor and the Council a resolution of appreciation for the work which I had so successfully performed on that important mission. The original resolution in Dr. Lloyd's handwriting is in my possession. The following is a copy of it as it appears on the official record:

"The Council expresses the high "appreciation of the services of Hon. "R. A. Squires, K.C., Colonial Secre-"tary, in obtaining from the Governor "in Council of Canada permission to "allow the transfer of Newfoundland "owned vessels from Canadian to "Newfoundland Registry. Resolution "by Hon. W. F. Lloyd, His Majesty's "Attorney General and Acting Prime "Minister."

For that journey and that successful work I was paid to cover my services, my time and travelling expenses the same amount of money that Sir Michael Cashin was paid for each occasion when he went away in connection with loan matters. As to the efficiency by Sir Michael Cashin, I leave it to the public to judge, but I think everyone who has watched Sir Michael Cashin's career and has noted his behaviour in the House of Assembly during this session will agree that if Sir Michael Cashin was entitled to $2,500 for his services in connection with diplomatic missions to other countries in the interests of Newfoundland, the

value of my services would more nearly approach $25,000 than $2,500. However, $2,500 was the amount which I was paid.

There is another aspect of the matter to which I would call attention. Sir Michael Cashin is a man of wealth, and I honor him for his ability, insofar as he has dealt honestly, to have amassed great wealth. I was a professional man depending for my living and the maintenance of my home upon my income as a barrister and solicitor. One would think that Sir Michael Cashin, with his wealth, would not condescend to take from the Government of Newfoundland $5,000 for two visits to Canada and the United States in connection with raising loans for the Colony. If I had half the wealth that Sir Michael Cashin boasts of possessing I would deem it the greatest privilege of my life to serve my country without remuneration or reward. There was not one cent of profit in that $2,500 for myself. For the time and effort used I was not paid by the Government nearly so substantial a fee as any mercantile establishment would have been glad to offer me for similar successful services in a matter of half the importance and magnitude of the mission to which my efforts were directed on behalf of the Government of Newfoundland. To be absent from Newfoundland for three or four weeks, being a portion of November and the month of December, represented a personal loss to myself in connection with my business relations of more than the total amount paid me by the Newfoundland Government. I went as a matter of duty to the Government of which I was Colonial Secretary and to the country in the legislative halls of which I had a seat. I went when other members of Council would not volunteer and other members refused on the ground that they could not leave their business at that season to undertake the work, and instead of Sir Michael Cashin behaving as a man and a gentleman in this House, calling attention to the payment and expressing his appreciation of the services which were rendered, he has the impudence to attack me and include in his attack these insinuations. Sir Michael Cashin's conduct in this instance, as in other instances during this session of the Legislature has proven to this House and to the public his utter untrustworthiness as a politician, his incapacity as a leader, the vindictiveness which prompts his utterances and the baseness of his mind.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed certain Resolutions and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

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

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a bill respecting Municipal Affairs in the City of St. John's.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

TUESDAY, July 6th, 1920.

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

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Education the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Education Act," was introduced and read a first time and order-

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

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Minister of the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Education Act," was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Mr. Bennett gave notice of question.

Mr. Higgins gave notice of question.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain Resolutions which were read a first time as follows:

Public Debt and Management	$ 125,000.00
Agriculture and Mines	52,800.00
Marine and Fisheries	268,235.00
Roads, Bridges and Ferries	221,235.00
Postal and Telegraph Department	1,555,084.38
Customs	559,156.54
Contingencies	50,000.00
Pensions, Soldiers and Sailors	514,000.00

Mr. Chairman,—I propose to submit an explanation of the Estimates of the Fishery Department for the information of the Honourable members opposite. Instead of there being an increase in the estimates there will be a reduction. I propose to give the House three columns—one containing the estimates of last year, another the estimates asked for the coming year, and another containing the actual amount paid under the increase made by the Cashin Government last fall. The House will readily see just where the shoe pinches, so far as the Fishery Department Estimates are concerned:

HEAD X.

Amount voted 1919-20 Estimates	$128,658.00
Supplemental Supply asked for to cover overdrafts for the year 1919-20	161,841.40
	$290,472.40

In view of the fact that $290,472.00 was expended in 1919-20 under Head X; the asking for $268,235.00, is not to be considered excessive; but on the contrary a saving of $22,237.00.

Taking the comparisons you will see the facts:—

Marine and Fisheries Department Votes under Head X.	Expenditure for year 1919-20.	Estimates for year 1919-20.
Salaries outside such as Wardens	$ 5,413.22	$ 5,500.00
Meteorological Service	6,000.00	6,000.00
Herring Fishery Protection	800.00	800.00
Public Wharves (hire, repairs, keepers		
Expenses S. S. "Fiona" (Customs protection)	55,000.00	

Travelling Expenses Department of Fish-ies	1,650.00		1,650.00
Incidentals	150.00		150.00
Lobster Label Expenses and Salmon Label Expenses	2,100.00		2,100.00
and Light)	2,000.00		2,500.00
Harbour Master, St. John's, $120; Boat-man $650	1,037.69		845.00
Night Boatman and Sundries	40.00		40.00
Instruction to Masters and Mates, and Asst. Examiners	1,545.54		1,550.00
In aid Instruction Drawing, Mechanical Engineers	300.00		300.00
Cold Storage for bait	5,000.00		5,000.00
Enforcement of Bait Laws	8,000.00		8,000.00
Bounty on ships built	52,436.16	'X'	16,000.00
Marine works	15,000.00		15,000.00
Dredging	32,621.29		33,000.00
Propagation of Lobsters	22,598.68		23,000.00
Amount in aid Game & Inland Fishery Board	16,200.00		20,000.00
Herring Fishery Expenses	11,910.77		12,000.00
Cod Liver Oil Expenses	6,719.52		6.800.00
Export of Fish Board	8,000.00		8,000.00
New Steamers, two, "Daisy" and "Lobelia"			50,000.00
Trade Commissioners			50,000.00
Grand Bank Hr. Construction	30,000.00		
	$290,472.40		$268,235.00

Bounty on ships built, $52,436.16 is the required amount for this year.

$16,000.00 is asked for in the Estimates for 1920-21; but this is one of the very few votes that cannot be estimated correctly.

$16,000.00, however, is put in this year's requirements (1920-21), with the distinct understanding that it may be altogether too little, as we do not know how many vessels are likely to be built during the year which bounty may have to be paid on.

There are new votes for $50,000.00: two new steamers, and this amount will have to be very carefully expended to meet the ever higher cost of operating steamers.

$50,000.00 for Trade Commissions and their expenses.

$8,000.00 for expenses in connection with the Fish Export Board.

The Department of Marine and Fisheries is of necessity a large expending Department in consequence of the nature of the work under its control.

But this year the collection of fees from Cod Fish Licenses together with 10c. quintal on fish exported, will amount to $150,000. The savings in cost of delivering supplies will amount to $20,000 and if the rescue ship operates she will pay her expenses, consequently the votes of $50,000 for Trade Commissioners and $50,000 for operating the two steamers, and $8,000 for Advisory Board expenses, will in all probability be wiped out and a balance of $50,000 or more remain to the credit of the Department.

ON ACCOUNT OF ST. LAWRENCE	
FOG ALARM AND LIGHT—NEW	
Replacing plant destroyed by lightning	4,000.00
ON ACCOUNT OF LAMALINE FOG ALARM—NEW	
Including new whistle house	4,000.00
GREEN ISLAND, CATALINA—NEW	
Replacing outfit now there	12,000.00
OIL TANKS	
10,550 gallon oil tanks	3,500.00
CHANCE BROS. ORDER	
11Acetylene Lights, Repairs Ferryland Light, 1 Re-charging station, 1, 5″ fog alarm outfit	50,000.00
2, 3″ fog alarms	25,000.00

HEAD 2.

Votes Passed in House of Assembly Estimates 1919-20

Salaries	$26,492.33
Supplemental Supply asked for to cover percentage on salaries	10,500.00
Total for year 1919-20..	$36,992.33

Vote asked for House of Assembly Estimates

1920-21	$42,576.00
Increase	$ 5,583.67

	Voted Estimates 1919-20	Actual Payment 1919-20	Voted for 1920-21
Deputy M. F..	$1,680.00	$ 2,516.00	$ 2,500.00

Secty. Fishery Bd.	500.00	650.00	500.00
First Clerk and Accountant. .	1,203.75	2,000.00	1,800.00
Second Clerk.	875.00	1,237.50	1,200.00
Third Clerk.	811.25	1,150.62	1,150.00
Fouth Clerk and Messenger. .	780.00	780.00	750.00
Typewriter.	650.00	1,032.20	720.00
Store Keeper.	585.00	860.50	1,000.00
Examiner Master and Mates and Ships' Husband.	1,610.00	2,000.00	2,000.00
Quarantine Officer.	650.00	845.00	845.00
Lloyd's Surveyor.	1,216.66	1,459.00	1,800.00
Inspector of Lighthouses. . . .	2,400.00	2,760.00	2,500.00
Lighthouse Typewriter.	625.00	812.50	720.00
Secty. Lighthouse Dept.	1,260.00	1,900.00	1,800.00
Lighthouse Mechanician.	1,260.00		
Inspector of Boilers.	1,536.00	1,843.20	1,843.20
Asst. Inspector of Boilers. . . .	1,440.00	1,728.00	1,728.00
Inspector Pickled Fish.	885.00	1,150.50	
Inspector Fisheries.	1,250.00		
Deputy Surveyor Shipping. . .	750.00	975.00	975.00
Secty. Herring Fishery Board. .	1,250.00	1,800.00	
Cod Liver Oil & Herring Insp. .	1,440.00	1,728.00	1,750.00
Cod Liver Oil & Herring Insp. .	1,440.00	1,728.00	1,750.00
Cod Liver Oil & Herring Insp. .	1,200.00	1,440.00	1,500.00
Lobster Propaga'n & Her. Insp.	1,250.00	1,500.00	1,500.00
Herring Inspector.		900.00	900.00
Typewriter.		420.00	720.00
Secretary to Minister.			1,200.00
Supt. Marine Construction. . .			1.500.00
Secty. Fishery Advisory Board.			500.00
Supt. of Fisheries.			5,000.00

New Appointments Not Included In Last Year's Estimates

Secretary Minister (Clouter)	$1,200.00
Typewriter (Gardner)	720.00
Superintendent Marine Construction (Hawco)	1,500.00
Superintendent Fisheries	5,000.00
Secretary Advisory Board (Hutchings)	500.00
New positions	$8,920.00
Salaries saved $5,812.00	
Salary Light Inspector saved 2,500.00	8,312.00

Increase for 1920-21 . . . . . $ 608.00

New Appointments This Year But Included In Last Year's Estimates.

Lighthouse Mechanician (Cornick) $1,512.00
Inspector Fisheries (Dee) 1,500.00
Secretary Herring Fishery Board (Badcock) 1,500.00
Pickled Fish Inspector (Fitzgerald) 1,300.00

$5,812.00

We propose to dispense with the position of Lighthouse Inspector as soon as the Government can transfer Mr. Goodison to another position and two sub-inspectors will be appointed—one North and one South,—who will reside in their sections and give all their time to inspection, supervising and construction. Two such men are now employed by the Department and are paid out of construction votes. Their appointment would therefore not add to the amount of the general vote.

Votes Passed by House of Assembly Estimates

1919-20 (Head 2) Contingencies. $1,850.00
Supplemental Supply asked for to cover expenditure
1919-20 . . . . . 6,500.00

$8,350.00

Vote Asked For House Assembly Estimates

1920-21 . . . . . $10,000.00

Increase $1,600.00

It is not likely that the vote will be spent, but if not it can revert to the Treasury.

HEAD VIII.—LIGHTHOUSES.

Votes asked for House of Assembly Estimates 1919-20. . $185,854.65
Additional Estimates voted Estimates 1919-20 . . . . . 41,420.00

$227,274.65

Supplemental supply asked for to cover Expenditure
1919-20 . . . . . 81,681.00

Total for year 1919-20 . . . . . $308,955.65

Estimates asked for 1920-21 . . . . . $210,771.39
Additional Estimates 1920-21 . . . . . $121,300.00

$332,071.39

Increase of . . . . . $ 23,115.74

It will be noted that this year's estimates include the erection of 11 acetylene lights, 4 fog alarms of superior quality, 1 compressor outfit, completion of St. Lawrence light and alarm, the equipment of preparing light at $4,000 cost.

MAINTENANCE	1919-20	1920-21
	$93,032.00	$93,847.00

These amounts are for maintenance only, such as oil, fuel, etc., etc., and the estimated requirements are that this figure will suffice for the year 1920-21.

The amount of $93,032.00 estimated in 1919-20 had to be supplemented by an amount of $50,650.00 for the following expenditures:

Extra cost on freight and coals	$2,000.00
Bay Roberts—new house	3,000.00
Carbonear—landing; store damaged by storm	800.00
Cabbage Hd.—storm damages	300.00
Cape St. Francis—storm damages	1,000.00
Cape Spear—storm damages	750.00
Cape Bonavista—repairing house	200.00
Shoe Cove Pt.—damaged by fire and storm	500.00
Fortune—damaged by fire	500.00
Baccalieu Alarm—storm damages	1,000.00
Channel Head—storm damages	1,200.00
Lamaline—New store	1,000.00
St. Lawrence—damage by lightning	4,000.00
Gas accumulators	2,000.00
Ferryland Hd.—Casing iron tower	2,000.00
Sagona & Penguin Is. West—Landing oil tanks	500.00
Dodding Hr.—Landing place	700.00
Pt. Verde—New tower	1,500.00
Powell's Hr.—Storm damages	600.00
Fort Amherst—Repairing masonry and light tower	2,000.00
Goose Cove—Erecting light	500.00
Newtown—Erecting light	600.00
Lower Sandy Pt.—New house	750.00
Woody Pt.—Erecting light	750.00
Estimated expenditure for balance April, May and June...	6,500.00
St. Lawrence—new fog alarm	8,000.00
Lamaline—New fog alarm	8,000.00
	$50,650.00

Making for the year 1919-20 not $93,032.00 as asked for, but $143,682.00 expended.

CONTINGENCIES

Extra cost printing, stationery, telegrams, etc., etc. .. ..$ 500.00

BLOCKHOUSE SALARIES

Percentage on salaries 304.00

BLOCKHOUSE MAINTENANCE & NOON GUN

Extra cost supplies, coal and powder. Extra supply coal and assistance to Keeper on account of fire 1,200.00

NOON GUN SALARIES

Percentage on salaries 27.00

CAPE TELEPHONE SERVICE

Anglo contract telephone to Capt St. Francis 3,000.00

Last year kero oil cost 40c. per gallon by the cask; in 1918 it cost 40c per gallon. The wholesale price last year paid by the suppliers of the oil was 31½ cents, and 34 cents in 1918 less 5½ duty. This therefore shows that the Department paid 8½ cents profit on 1200 casks, 51,600 gals or $4,378 handed out to a jobber or grafter in one year, and about the same amount in 1918. This matter will be investigated by the Commission of Enquiry now sitting. This year while kero. oil has increased in value 6c. per gallon over last year's rates, would cost the Department 46c. per gallon. We are supplying oil at 28 cents per gallon and reducing the quantity by 20 per cent., as we have cut out wood casks and sent only steel barrels, which will prevent leakage—18 cents per gallon is therefore saved to the Dept. this year on 50,000 gallons, or $9,000. This amount is still reduced 20 per cent. by lessening the supplies by 10,000 gallons. This is a serious matter, and one that the public and this House should go to the bottom of.

During the year acetylene lights have been erected at Fort Amherst, Mouse Island, Curzon Hd., Bonne Bay, Boxey Point, F.B., Honey Pass Island, B.B., Squarey Head, B.B.

UNDER ADDTIONAL ESTIMATES

This expenditure of $121,300.00 is for special work as explained.

In supplemental supply for 1919-20, $8,000.00 is asked for in each case to cover work and machinery bought and paid for in this year, and the $4000.00 each asked for as additional estimates for 1920-21 is to cover the cost of completion of this work, so that each year's work may appear in the year that the work and cost of same was done.

GREEN ISLAND, CATALINA

$12,000.00 for new fog alarm plant.

OIL TANKS

$3,500.00 to purchase ten 550 gallon kerosene oil tanks to be placed at ten light stations.

11 ACEYTLENE LIGHTS

To be erected at the following places:—English Hr. West, West Burgeo, LaPoile, Rencontre, Point Verde, Herring Neck, Harbour Grace, Puffin Island, B.B., and Labrador.

FERRYLAND LIGHT.

Apparatus to greatly improve the existing Light is being imported, consisting of an incandescent oil vapour burner, similar to Cape Spear.

RE-CHARGING STATION.

To refill the cylinders used at the Acetylene Light Stations with acetylene, instead of having to send these cylinders to New Jersey, U.S.A., to be refilled as we do at present.

3 FOG ALARM OUTFITS.

For Baccalhao—Cabot Island or Twillingate, Long Pt., St. Lawrence and Lamaline will have Fog Alarms and Lights completed this season.

HEAD 2—REGULAR ESTIMATES

1919	$36,992.33
1920	42,576.00
Increase	$5,583.67
Voted estimates last year	$20,317.33
Actual amount spent of which I am not responsible for a cent	$37,000.00

Amongst officials included this year but paid from contingencies last year are Hy. Inspector Dunphy at $900, 2 typists at $720—$1440—which if paid as last year would reduce the increase for wages under Head 2 to $3,243—and this in spite of the additional staff required to carry out the Fish Regulations and the addition to the staff of a Supt. of Fisheries and a Supt. of Marine Works. The latter official has already saved to the country 20 times his salary—and will continue to do so.

HEAD VIII.—LIGHTHOUSES, BLOCKHOUSE, ETC.

Estimate of Expenditure for which Votes of the Legislature are required	Voted in Estimates 1919–20	Estimate 1920–21	Actually paid 1919–20
LIGHTHOUSE SALARIES			
STATIONS:—			
Red Bay	$ 405.00	$ 526.50	$ 526.50

Goose Cove	75.00	100.00	
Jackson's Arm	187.00	250.00	243.75
Seal Cove	187.00	250.00	243.75
Western Cove	187.50	250.00	243.75
Conche	281.25	250.00	365.62
Groais Island	46.87	100.00	60.93
Inglee	187.50	250.00	243.75
Williamsport	46.87	100.00	60.93
St. Anthony	405.00	526.50	526.50
Great Hr. Deep	46.87	100.00	60.93
Griquet	281.25	250.00	365.62
Gull Island Light	682.65	900.00	887.44
Gull Island Light Assistant	565.50	750.00	735.15
Gull Island Light Alarm	997.50	1,200.00	1,296.75
Gull Island Light Courier	135.00	175.00	175.50
Nipper's Harbour	506.25	658.12	658.12
Little Bay Islands	344.25	447.52	447.52
St. Michael's Head	344.25	200.00	447.52
Long Island, N.D.B	858.45	1,200.00	1,115.98
Leading Tickles	425.25	552.82	552.82
Long Island, Courier	121.50		146.45
Twillingate Wharf	187.50	250.00	243.75
Twillingate, Long Point	710.32	923.41	923.41
Long Point, Twillingate, Asst	565.50	735.15	735.15
Fortune Harbour	506.25	658.12	658.12
Mill Point, Botwood	281.25	250.00	365.62
Lower Sandy Point	375.00	550.00	487.50
Grassy Island	375.00	550.00	487.50
Cabbage Head	421.87	550.00	548.43
Black Island	421.87	550.00	548.43
Sergeant's Cove Head	778.80	1,200.00	1,012.44
Baccalhao	778.80	1,200.00	1,012.44
Herring Neck	344.25	100.00	447.52
Ragg's Island	344.25	400.00	447.52
Change Islands, S.E	506.25	550.00	658.12
Change Islands, N.W	187.50	250.00	243.75
Cann Island	691.87	900.00	899.43
Burnt Point, Light and Alarm, Seldom Come By	885.00	1,200.00	1,150.50
Stag Hr. Run Buoys	187.50	250.00	243.75
Tilton	187.00	250.00	243.75
Joe Batt's Arm	585.00	750.00	760.50
Wadham Islands	858.45	1,200.00	1,115.98

Peckford's Island	858.45	1,200.00	1,115.98
Muddy Shag	62.50	100.00	81.25
Musgrave Hr	187.50	250.00	243.75
Penguin Island North	858.45	1,200.00	1,115.98
Cabot Island	858.45	1,200.00	1,115.98
Cabot Island, Courier	112.50	150.00	146.25
Wesleyville	62.50	100.00	81.25
Templeman Leading Lights		100.00	
Honey Pot Island, Newtown		100.00	
Puffin Island	585.00	750.00	760.50
Puffin Island Alarm	885.00	900.00	1,150.50
Shoe Cove Point	585.00	550.00	760.50
Little Denier	778.80	100.00	1,012.44
King's Cove	506.25	550.00	658.12
Happy Adventure	93.75	120.00	121.87
Cape Bonavista Light	710.32		923.41
Cape Bonavista Assistant	565.50	750.00	735.15
Cape Bonavista Alarm	997.50	800.00	1,296.75
Squarry Head	344.25	100.00	447.52
Melrose	93.75	120.00	121.87
Green Island, Catalina	627.65	850.00	815.94
Green Island, Catalina, Asst	620.50	800.00	806.65
Catalina, Hr. Light	150.00	120.00	195.00
Fort Point	281.25	400.00	365.62
Fort Point Alarm	706.25	900.00	918.12
Fort Point Assistant	506.25	650.00	658.12
Ragged Island	585.00	800.00	760.50
Random	778.80	1,000.00	1,012.44
Hopeall Head		100.00	
Heart's Content	425.25	550.00	552.82
Hant's Harbour	281.25	400.00	365.62
Jean's Head	585.00	800.00	760.50
Old Perlican	506.25	650.00	658.12
Baccalieu Light	990.00	1,200.00	1,287.00
Baccalieu Courier	150.00	195.00	195.00
Baccalieu Alarm	1,089.00	1,200.00	1,306.80
Baccalieu Alarm Courier	75.00	97.50	97.50
Western Bay	788.80	1,000.00	1,012.44
Carbonear Island, Acetylene	585.00	760.00	760.50
Hr. Grace Island, Acetylene	585.00	100.00	760.50
Estimate of Expenditure for which Votes of the Legislature are required	Voted in Estimates 1919–20	Estimate 1920–21	Actually paid 1919–20

Hr. Grace Beacon & Bar Buoys	450.00	585.00	585.00
Bay Roberts	479.00	650.00	622.70
Bay Roberts	100.00	130.00	130.00
Brigus	585.00	780.00	760.50
Cupids	585.00	780.00	760.50
Salmon Cove	344.25	450.00	447.52
Cape St. Francis Light & Alarm	710.32	850.00	923.41
Cape St. Francis Assistant	645.75	800.00	839.47
St. John's Leading Lights:			
Congregational Church		200.00	
King's Wharf		200.00	676.00
St. John's, Narrow's Buoys	187.00	250.00	243.75
North Head, St. John's	750.00		
Fort Amherst, Light and Alarm	1,100.00	1,200.00	
do. do. Courier		120.00	1,320.00
Cape Spear, Light and Alarm	781.75	1,000.00	1,016.27
Cape Spear, L. & A., Assistant	781.25	900.00	919.42
Cape Spear, L. & A., 2nd Asst.	565.50	750.00	735.15
Bay Bulls	778.80	1,000.00	1,012.44
Ferrland	885.00	1,150.50	1,150.50
Powell's Head, Light & Alarm.	1,100.00	1,200.00	
Powell's Head, L. & A., Courier		120.00	1,320.00
Cape Pine	926.25	1,200.00	1,204.12
Point LaHaye	425.00	550.00	552.50
Cape St. Mary's	1,031.25	1,200.00	1,237.50
Cape St. Mary's, Courier	30.00	50.00	39.00
Point Verde, Light and Alarm.	1,028.50	1,200.00	1,234.20
Placentia, L. Lights	281.25	385.00	365.62
Point LaTine	425.25	550.00	552.82
Marticot	778.80	1,000.00	1,012.44
Marticot, Courier	37.50	50.00	48.75
Long Island	778.80	1,000.00	1,012.44
Long Island Courier	112.50	150.00	146.25
Flat Island	281.25	350.00	365.62
Tide's Point, Light and Alarm	997.50	1,200.00	1,296.75
Iron Island	100.00	130.00	130.00
Dodding Head	682.65	850.00	887.44
Dodding Head, Assistant	565.50	750.00	735.15
Little Burin Is., Light & Alarm	997.50	1,200.00	1,296.75
St. Lawrence, Light & Alarm.	997.50	1,200.00	1,296.75
Green Island, Light & Alarm.	1,100.00	900.00	
Green Is., L. & A., Assistant.		600.00	1,320.00
Green Is., L. & A., Courier	112.50	150.00	146.25

Lamaline, Light & Alarm	421.87	1,200.00	548.43
Lamaline Leading Lights	281.25	400.00	365.62
Brunette	949.05	1,200.00	1,233.76
Fortune	375.00	450.00	487.50
Grand Bank	281.25	400.00	365.62
Garnish	281.25	400.00	365.62
Long Hr. Point	506.25	650.00	658.12
Belleoram	281.25	400.00	365.62
Harbour Breton	281.25	400.00	365.62
St. Jacques	778.80	1,000.00	1,012.44
Sagona	997.50	1,200.00	1,296.75
Pass Island, Alarm	997.50	1,200.00	1,296.75
Pass Island, Light	585.00	750.00	760.50
Gaultois	281.25	400.00	365.62
Pushthrough	46.87	100.00	60.93
Boxey Point	75.00	100.00	97.50
Penguin Is. W., Light & Alarm	997.50	1,200.00	1,296.75
Ramea	778.80	1,000.00	1,012.44
Boar Island	585.00	750.00	760.50
Ireland Island	826.00	1,000.00	1,073.80
Rse Blanche Point Light	627.30	800.00	815.49
Rose Blanche Alarm	885.00	1,200.00	1,150.50
Bad Neighbour Buoy	93.75	100.00	121.87
Burnt Island	375.00	500.00	487.50
Isle au Morts	375.00	500.00	487.50
Port aux Basques	650.00	850.00	845.00
Channel Hr. Light and Alarm	1,083.37	1,200.00	1,304.00
Codroy Island		250.00	
Crabbes	112.50	150.00	146.25
Fishells	112.50	150.00	146.25
Sandy Point Light	475.00	650.00	617.50
Sandy Point Wharf Light			
St. George's, Leading Light	196.87	250.00	255.93
Black Duck Brook, Leading L.		250.00	
Cape St. George, L. & A.	997.50	1,200.00	1,296.75
Port au Port	585.00	750.00	760.50
Broad Cove Point	93.75	100.00	121.87
Little Port Head	778.80	1,000.00	1,012.44
Frenchman's Head	506.25	650.00	658.12
Eagle Island	93.75	120.00	121.87
Lobster Cove Head	778.80	1,000.00	1,012.44
Woody Point	75.00	100.00	97.50
Cow Head	585.00	750.00	760.50

Kepple Island	506.25	650.00	658.12
Port aux Choix	150.00	200.00	195.00
Assizes Harbour	100.00		130.00
Double Island	778.80	750.00	1,012.44
Domino	585.00	750.00	760.50
Indian Tickle	778.00	750.00	1,012.44
Cape North	585.00	750.00	760.50
Pack's Harbour	585.00	750.00	760.50
Cut Throat	585.00	750.00	760.50
Winsor Harbour	585.00	750.00	760.50
Manuel's Island	585.00	750.00	760.50
Cape Harrigan	585.00	750.00	760.50
Ford's Hr	585.00	750.00	760.50
Kelligrew's Wharf Light	37.50	50.00	48.75
St. George's, Turf Point	28.12	35.00	36.55
St. George's Wharf Light	28.12	35.00	36.55
Brig Bay	18.75		
Leading Tickles. Wharf Light	28.12	35.00	36.55
Fredericton	28.12	35.00	36.55
Wesleyville, Wharf Light	46.87	100.00	60.93
Lance au Loup	93.75	120.00	121.87
West St. Modeste	93.75	120.00	121.87
Forteau	37.50	50.00	48.75
Daniel's Harbour	18.75	25.00	24.37
Current Island	46.87	50.00	60.93
Greenspond Leading Light	46.87	50.00	60.93
Joe Batt's Arm, Beacon	46.87	100.00	60.93
Fogo		60.00	
Bragg's Island	37.50	50.00	48.75
Salvage Bay	37.50	50.00	48.75
Newell's Island	22.50	25.00	29.25
St. Lawrence Beach	46.87	60.00	60.93
St. Lawrence Wharf Light	45.00	60.00	58.50
Spaniard's Bay Wharf Light		50.00	
Pouch Cove	18.75	25.00	24.37
Portugal Cove	46.87	50.00	60.93
Branch	37.50	50.00	48.75
St. Bride's Fog Horn	112.50	150.00	146.25
		$109,501.14	$113,840.56

We will cut out Light-keeping, Labrador, and place Acetylene lights —saving $6500 in salaries.

The bill for maintenance will not be larger in spite of increased cost of supplies as paint and outfit for private use and oil will be reduced 20 per cent.

The bill for Paint will also be reduced as I propose to have the buildings painted every second year instead of annually which is a waste of $10,000.

The vote for lighthouse salaries 1919-20, $113,840; 1920-21, $109,501 —or $4339.00 less than last year's vote.

The said Resolution being read a second time it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein and the said Resolutions were agreed to.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs 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 to-morrow.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Before the passing of Ways and Means I would like to say a word or two. I may say we all expected something good in the Budget when it was brought down as we were promised reduction in taxation. The Government of which I had the honour to be a member, was accused of taxing the fishermen too much. And one of the principle promises made by the present Government to the people of the Colony was that if elected to power reduction in taxation would take place. Now that is one of the promises unfulfilled by the Government. They have not attempted in the Budget before us to reduce the taxation on the fishermen of the Colony. There are a few simple items of no account mentioned in the Budget and the Minister in charge has made no attempt to tell the House and the Country what is the reason why no attempt was made to reduce taxation. When references in the past have been made to the surplus the late Government left we were accused of taxing the fishermen on uneven basis and that we should reduce the taxation and collect only sufficient sum of money to meet the expenditure of the Colony. Here we are to-day asked to pass Ways and Means by the very same men who made this promise to the people of the country and also that everything possible would be done to open up new industries throughout the country. In looking down the manifesto I come across a few of those things promised to the people and on taxation he goes on to say: (Reads Manifesto). To-day we are asked to pass practically the same Budget that was passed in the House last year. Further he says: (Reads section of Manifesto).

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—I may say for the information of the honourable member that in the case of the importation of kerosene oil there is no duty on such that is imported in wooden barrels.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—If duty free in wooden barrels why not in steel barrels? I take it that even if the fishermen paid the tax on the steel barrels they would be better off than buying kerosene oil in wooden barrels and get them duty free. The wooden barrel is going out of use as far as kerosene is concerned because the wastage out of it is more than the duty payable on it, when imported. There is no reason why kerosene in steel barrels should not come in duty free.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—The reason why kerosene is allowed in duty free in wooden barrels is because we felt and thought that if we did not take this course there would be no packages to export cod oil in.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—If you charge the fishermen on the steel barrel and allow the wooden barrel in duty free, then while the wastage from the wooden one is sometimes ten gallons, he gets one hundred per cent in the steel one and while the wastage amounts to more than the duty on the steel one he is paying for the wooden barrel for somebody else's requirements. Do you think you are doing a justifiable thing in allowing these wooden barrels to come in duty free when the inducement is held out to simply have enough of them to meet the demands of the merchant and the planter? The fishermen to-day will take the steel barrels in preference to the wooden ones. In allowing in kerosene in wooden barrels you are not giving the fishermen any privilege but you extend the privilege to the merchant and the planter who will need the barrels. Now what about fishermen's engines as promised in the manifesto of the Prime Minister? There is a tax of 11 per cent on all engines coming in and there is no reason why they should not come in duty free and on the back of that you have the surplus which I left there when I left the Department, namely, two millions of dollars, and now at the end of the fiscal year I presume you must now have at the Bank of Montreal nearly four millions of dollars. Why not relinquish this tax of 11 per cent on all engines imported for the fishery purposes? I would like to hear an explanation of these things before passing Ways and Means. The Prime Minister made all those promises last Fall and some of the people must think he was sincere when he made them. (Reads section of Manifesto). We are told by the Finance Minister that kerosene in wooden barrels is allowed in duty free because the barrels are required for the use of the merchant and the planter. This is a simple inducement to import it in a wooden barrel in preference to a steel barrel. When the wooden package is left to the eye of the sun during this season of the year the depreciation and evaporation is considerable. But take the steel barrel and even if he pays a little more for it, the depreciation is very little, may be one per cent. Then this manifesto goes on to say: (Reads). The only articles named in the Budget as being duty free are as follows: (Reads). I would like to ask the Minister in charge who has benefited by this Manifesto and those articles enumerated as duty free? This Budget is not in keeping with the manifesto. There is nothing pertaining to the fishermen of the Colony. The fishermen of the Colony don't use any agricultural implements. Bark and cutch are about the only things that they use. The whole thing in a nutshell is this, you haven't reduced taxation. You have made no attempt to carry out the manifesto handed to the country by your leader last fall.

Because some member in the Upper House made reference to some irregularities in the management of the Finance Department you have made a

change. How are you going to keep the information of that Department from your colleagues? There is no reference whatever to roads and bridges. Here is what the Prime Minister said last fall in his manifesto:

"Newfoundlanders are groaning today under the heavy burden of taxation. A revenue of $9,000,000 is being annually wrung out of a quarter of a million people. In other words, every man, woman, and child in the Island has imposed upon him a per capita tax of $36.00 per year. A reorganization of the public service and a business-like administration of affairs will make a substantial reduction in taxation possible without in any way interfering with Newfoundland's capacity to meet her financial obligations and substantially improve her public services. The dilapidated condition of affairs in Newfoundland is due not to a lack of revenue, but to the orgy of corruption which has been going on for some years, a carnival of squandering, grossest incapacity, and an entire lack of the application of the most elementary principles of business common-sense.

"I propose a complete reorganization of the tariff. Marine and other internal combustion engines used in the fisheries and other industries of the Colony shall be imported duty free. Kerosene and gasolene used for purposes of power in connection with the fisheries and other industries of the Colony, shall be admitted free of duty. The tariff shall be so balanced that every person shall bear some share of the public expense of the Colony, but each person shall bear his share in proportion to his ability to pay. The necessaries of life will bear the minimum of taxation; the luxuries of life the maximum of taxation.

"I propose a reorganization of the method of accounting in connection with Income, Excess Profits, and Death Duties taxation. Under the present system the Minister of Finance has by law access to the private books of account, invoices and memoranda, of every company, business man, schooner owner and fisherman in the Colony. In view of the attack made in the Legislative Council during the past session of the Legislature by a member of the Executive Government, who, in an effort to silence a political opponent attempted to blackmail him by quoting private information appertaining to duty bonds filed many years ago in the Department of Finance and Customs, I am of the opinion that the private affairs of the business men and fishermen of this country should not be open to the inspection of politicians of the blackmailing and unscrupulous class.

"While it is not probable that there will ever again be a man connected with public life in this Colony who would descend to the baseness to which certain politicians descended some few months ago, yet the law should be so changed as to free the merchant and fisherman alike from the thought of the possibility of such a political partisan use being made again of private business information. I consequently propose to inaugurate a system whereby an independent accountant having the same independence and rank as the Auditor General of the Colony shall be put in charge of all matters relating to the Business Profits Tax, Income Tax, Estate Death Duties, and similar returns of a confidential and private nature. That accountant would have the same power of examination of private books and records as the Minister of Finance now has, but this work should be subject to the inspection and control of the Auditor General only and his records would not be available for partisan political use as appears pos-

sible at present in view of the incident above referred to.

"I am satisfied that there can be such a readjustment of tariff as will bring in a revenue, in conjunction with the Income Tax and Excess Profits Tax, which will materially lighten the burden of unjust and harsh taxation now bearing upon the people, and provide a sufficient revenue to meet all obligations, develop improved public service, and provide a small annual reserve to be kept for the Colony's purposes and not to be lavishly expended for electioneering purposes as is such a large proportion of the taxation exacted from the people during the past year."

The same old grants are mentioned in the Budget as the year before. Out of that half million dollars allocated last fall considerable work was done. Many bridges and wharves were attended to. We are promised in that manifesto that all this would receive attention, and I can't nd an item in the budget speech referring to road work. There is a reference made in the manifesto to a reorganization of the Public Works Department. I would like to know from the Minister of Public Works if any reorganization has taken place in his department. You haven't adopted anything new, and I take it you are going along in the same old rut as your predecessor. The only thing that we have heard of is the checking in the split department. The business ability of the gentlemen in charge and his staff is known throughout the country to be very high, and no doubt there will be a great change.

Now we will leave that department and go to the department of Agriculture and Mines. I would like for someone to tell me what great changes have taken place there. I noticed an advertisement some time ago by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines regarding returned soldiers and sailors. I would like to know from the Minister of Finance and Customs what number of soldiers and sailors have applied for financial aid.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—None have applied to me so far.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—It means that your energy in that direction so far has been wasted. None of the returned men have applied. If they did apply to the Civil Re-establishment Committee, that Committee would have to get the money from you. I understand that the Civil Re-establishment Committee is under a cloud, and that their resignation is in the hands of the Government.

It was absurd for any man to think that he was going to get any of our returned men to settle down on land around St. John's West. The men who went to war were fishermen, and you can't make successful farmers out of fishermen. Now what have you done for the returned soldier in the budget before the House? The late Government promised that the returned men would be placed on the same footing as the Canadian men. That was carried out up to November last. What have you done? Nobody in this House seems to be responsible for the work of the Militia Department. You have not carried out the promise of your predecessors in this direction. It appears that the object of the present Government is to sail as close to the wind as possible, and have this House close without giving any statement as to what they propose to do for the returned men. Now this is your opportunity to make a statement. Deputations of returned men have waited on the Government from time to time. What do you propose to do about it? I have on my desk now a report headed "The G.W.V.A. Holds an Important Meeting." I take it that this committee of the G.W.V.A. was before the Government with regard to pensions,

and that only 20 per cent was granted.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—That is all they asked for.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—This report on the G.W.V.A. meeting goes on to say: (Reads report). What has been done in this direction? Can any gentleman in this House tell me this afternoon. Here is a report of a meeting of the Great War Veterans, setting out what they asked for, and surely some one can give us some information. We have not a man on the Government side of the House who can give us the least bit of information on this matter. This is not good enough, and surely something will be done for those men.

What is the Government policy with regard to agriculture? What are you going to do about it? You must today, sir, find yourself in a very false position. What have you told us in your budget with regard to the agricultural policy? We have been asked to vote some money, and we have been given absolutely no information as to the model farm, how you propose to educate the farmers, or any other information as to how you propose to spend this money. I take it that there are better farms in Newfoundland today than any that the Government can produce. All the people know about this model farm is that it is going to cost them $50,000 this year. It is a burden, which, if they had to choose themselves, they would not carry.

Now as to your program for labor. In his manifesto the Prime Minister makes a great splash about child labor, but nothing has been heard about it here unless it is in the bill which Dr. Barnes is to bring down to-morrow. The idea is a good one, one that has my greatest sympathy, and no time should be lost in doing something in that direction. You haven't made an attempt to carry out the promises that you have made to the electors of St. John's West. You came in here and you forget all the promises. The proof is contained in the budget which you have brought in here during the past few days. Now before I take my seat I want to remind the hon. member of another promise made to St. John's West. You stated in the manifesto that there were three factors that were making the necessaries of life so high in Newfoundland. The import and export rates by the R.N. Co. and other shipping companies, the enormous duties paid on goods imported into the Colony and criminal profiteering.

Reads from Manifesto:

"A very large share of the money expended in the construction and repair of roads and bridges is squandered. This is not due to any dishonesty on the part of Road Boards, Local Councils, or workmen. It is squandered because of the lack of intelligent organization and competent direction and supervision—no sane business man would think of handling Road Construction and Repair by the present methods of the Department of Public Works.

"I propose such a reorganization of that branch of the Department of Public Works which relates to roads and bridges as will put an efficient staff in charge of road construction and repair. The people of the Colony who work on the roads will be very much happier at finding that the work which they do is done under such direction as will make their work of some advantage to the community in which they live. It is the duty of the Government to provide such supervision, information and direction as will bring to the Colony value in good roads for the money expended.

"There are certain sections of the country which require liberal grants overland above the regular grants for the purpose of road construction. The regular grants voted year by year

would, if properly expended, put and keep existing roads in good condition, but it is impossible for districts where pioneer road work is required to undertake the construction of new roads and the necessary bridge work without special provision being made therefor by the Legislature. In addition to the present votes for the upkeep and maintenance of existing roads liberal provision must be made for pioneer road and construction work.

"The Department of Public Works requires reorganization also in the matter of the maintenance of public buildings and the purchasing of supplies. This is a large spending department, its accounts representing millions annually, yet there are no modern business methods of accounting, checking, and general supervision. The management and business methods of this large spending department of the people are not as efficient as the business management of a bull's-eye shop. The distribution of public funds in the form of political graft is a scandal; economy, equality and justice are unknown in the placing of orders for supplies for public institutions and contracts for public works. I propose to introduce business principles and methods into this Department of chaos and thereby give satisfaction to the public and save hundreds of thousands of dollars for the Colony."

Now can the Prime Minister or the Minister of Finance tell us what they are doing in that direction before this budget passes. Sugar they tell us has taken another jump and through the bungling of the Food Control Board we have to pay another three or four cents on a pound of sugar. I hope that the Minister of Finance in the absence of the Prime Minister will tell us what is going to be done in this direction. Last week I asked for a copy of the Finance contingencies account and the Minister told me it would take three or four days to prepare it. Here it is, have a look at it, you could do it in five or ten minutes. The reason why they didn't bring it in is because they had dipped down into the treasury and had given Mr. Squires $2500 for his expenses for that little trip to Canada and if I am not sure he has already been paid for this in 1917. I make the statement subject to correction. Mr. Squires was asked to go to Canada in connection with the transfer of some vessels, he took a week to go up there, called on Mr. Ballantyne and was a week returning for this little job he takes the sum of $2500. I believe that he has been paid for that already and I will take that back if that is not true. I am sorry that the Prime Minister is not here, he knows the budget is before the House and he should be here. I would like to ask him if it is true that an order has been sent to the committee for the investigation of the Woodford charges not to expend more than $50.00. In introducing the budget the Minister of Finance stated that next year he would have an estimated revenue of $11,200,000. The Customs revenue will be $7,000,000. He has not told us how he is going to get the rest. I would like to have him figure out to the House how next year we are going to have the estimated revenue of $11,200,000. Down through the debates on the estimates we have practically touched on every item in the budget and have pointed out what is going to happen to the country in the next 12 months. I don't want to take up the time of the House by any lengthy comment on the budget. If the catch of fish this year is going to be down to one and a quarter million quintals and the fishermen only get eight or ten dollars a quintal for their fish then you are going to find yourself on the wrong side of your books. I notice that nothing has been done for the herring fishery. The

Government has forgotten that last year we had a two million dollar industry in herring. The lobster fishery is practically a thing of the past. The sealfishery is a blank. Last year's catch was equal to the catch for one steamer a few year's ago. I think that before we close this House the herring fishery should be considered.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—This year's catch of herring will be inspected and nothing will be allowed to go out of the Colony without it bears the crown brand upon it. As far as we can do to restore the conditions we will do. There has been a great deal of slackness by buyers in allowing men to hold licenses to pack herring that shouldn't. We cannot cut out the small man and the matter must receive the serious consideration of the Government. It shall not be overlooked and the Marine and Fisheries Department will see that this is done. So far as the sugar situation is concerned I think that the best possible was done, under the circumstances. Take the case of the Union Trading Company. Last December we purchased large lots of sugar, and when the price was fixed by the Food Control Board we had 350 barrels purchased to arrive and which could be sold at 20 or 21 cents a pound. The Board took that and charged us 28½ cents wholesale and 30 cents retail. We stood to lose very considerable, but in the meantime I want to be fair to the Board who acted the fairest way in dealing with the country as a whole. If they had not stepped in we would be paying 38 cents a pound for sugar to-day instead of 30. If we allowed the public to come in and buy what they required it would be just a week or ten days when all the cheap shipment would be consumed. The Board did not take into consideration the interest and storage charged in fixing the price on this sugar and this is what is referred to in the announcement of to-day's papers. Out of the thousand tons of sugar that came in recently we purchased $60,000 worth and must pay the interest and other costs ourselves. Our instructions were if you do not order sugar now, you might not get it in the Fall. We were put in a critical position, owing to having to give up our cheap sugar but I consider nothing better could be done by the Board.

MR. BENNETT:—This country will during the next year experience a very serious disappointment when they become to realize the conditions that exist. It is quite true that during the past years of the war we had big revenues and large surpluses but when the war broke out we didn't have a dollar in the treasury to buy cotton uniforms for the men. We had to go to the Bank of Montreal to obtain a loan. The country at that time was in a deplorable state and that period in the history of the Colony has to be thoroughly known to be appreciated. The Government handled the situation to their own credit and without any financial loss. The crisis came with no great results at first but we were up against the problem of how we were going to finance the country in the days to come. We had to find ways and means to get money for purposes which we never had to look out for before. The present leader of the Opposition was Finance Minister at that time and handled the whole affair to his credit. Death duties were then singled out as a means to secure money. This was the first tax on the estates of those who could afford to pay. It was an unheard of thing for a man to leave anything he had except to his relatives and very often the money found its way into other countries. It was a reasonable action on the part of the Government that when a man had passed away and left an

amount of property this country was entitled to a part of it. It was then thought that many of those could well afford to give to the state a portion of the money and land that they had secured from the state.

MR. WALSH:—Before this vote goes thru I would like to have just one other word on behalf of the poor people. I refer to the vote for public charities. I notice that there has been a substantial increase, but I find that no provision has been made for an addition to the funds for the widows and the orphans. I hope that this has not been overlooked and that this is only a mistake. You can't expect us to increase our own salaries and forget the widow and the orphans. The cost of living has gone up by leaps and bounds and the poor widow and orphan can't buy a pair of shoes. Down in my district I have some very poor people to look after and I have pleaded with the Government that they may get some substantial increase, and what applies to my district applies to every other district in the country. There are widows with three and four children trying to live on the miserable sum of $6.00 every three months. That is not sufficient to keep the life in one infant, and they are dependant upon the charity of the neighbors. That we haven't attended to the wants of these poor unfortunate people is not to our credit. You voted yourselves $1000 and you have increased the salaries of the men in the Upper House, men who do not need it. There is no justfication for this, and you take the Honor away from the members of the Upper oHuse when you ask them to accept an increase. Another vote I would like to see increased, and that is the vote for the sick poor. I have them right down in my own district, they pass my door almost daily on the way to the hospital. I have had them at my own house, they having gone around to the hotels there and found that their allowance is too low to give them board. People also suffer very much from the inconvenience they meet with in trains. They are very often compelled to lie on the floors of baggage trains, while stretchers could easily be obtained and placed there for that purpose. If stretchers were provided this would be different.

MR. BENNETT:—I know how the matter was adusted by the Food Control Board, but I question whether events will prove that they were right, because sugar will be cheaper by the end of September next. A friend of mine in Montreal told me that the Newfoundland Government had been buying sugar from a manufacturing concern in Montreal for 25 cents a pound and he can buy it there for 20, though not from the same company. I also know that a large importer in St. John's made a statement not long since that he could import all the sugar he liked between then and the end of the year at 25 cents a pound.

HON. MIN. MARINE AND FISHERIES:—Have you a mesage from Montreal to that effect?

MR. BENNETT:—I got a letter.

HON. MIN. MARINE AND FISHERIES:—Wil you show it to me?

MR. BENNETT:—I will. The writer is a gentleman who has been in New York in connection with this same matter. There is something radically wrong about the whole situation. You, the Government, are contemplating a contingency that will never arise. It is something like the coal situation, it is shrouded in mystery. Somebody is getting a rake off. Probably the profiteers are being shut out by the Government and the effects are being felt.

Most of the sugar here before the Control Board took up the work was imported at 18 1-2 cents a pound and the owners of that sugar were compelled to give it to the Control Board, who sold it at 28 1-2, thus allowing the real owners of it a profit of 5 cents and the Board 5 cents. I say this is an interference with legitimate trade. I dot not know what conclusive evidence they have to expect this extraordinary high price for sugar next fall. If the people of the country, the consumers, have to pay 40 cents a pound, then there is a remedy for it and that is to do without it. I cannot see how the people's interests were protected. They are paying 32 cents for it to-day, and the retailers, I understand, met the other day to raise the price in the city, because they cannot handle it for a profit of a cent and a half a pound, considering the payment of help and the time lost generally in the handling of it. And they are quite justified, I think, in taking this position.

The net result of the whole transaction is that the Control Board are not able to do business in the way that they anticipated. It is not an answer that the Board did not figure on wharfage and storage charges. They must have contemplated this, and if they did'nt, well it's a question of incompetency and incapacity on their part. They should have contemplated and they should have realised that the men who purchased sugar for their retail shops every Monday morning thought that the price for sugar was fixed up to the end of December next. If the price is put on these men they will lose on the transaction. This was the contract entered into between the trade and the Control Board a short time ago. Any attempt to raise the price until the end of December next is a breach of contract and a breach of faith and should not be allowed. Why the price of sugar here is so enormously high that one cannot appreciate it. We all know that it is through shortage of crops that sugar is so scarce. Governments of other countries all over the world are trying to control it and get the price within the range of normal and I believe that before many weeks are over the result will be evident.

Certain allusions were made here this afternoon to the Bell Island ore taxes and to the price of coal. I would like to say that I do not think that the answer of the Minister of Justice yesterday, who spoke on behalf of the Government in relation to this matter is quite satisfactory. We may be faced in this country within the next year or two with the position that many people will want employment and if the other avenues of employment outside the fisheries are not found there will be nothing left for the people to do but to emigrate. The great project set on foot, namely, the Empire Steel Merger, will mean a great deal for the development of this country. I understand that the Directors associated with this company came here to see what the Government were going to do in relation to the export tax on ore. When that tax was first introduced it was intended to make the tax 20c. per ton. Recommendations were made to the Government in office at that time and it was decided to make it 7½c. for ten years. Now we do not want to hamper a new industry surely, and if the tax of 7½c. is too little, the Government having the experience of past Governments, should name the tax to be paid by those companies in the future. The promoters, I understand, have not come to a definite understanding with the Newfoundland Government as to what the pro-

posed tax is going to be. The question of $1 per ton, of course, was merely a statement made by the Hon. Mr. Coaker at one of his Conventions. This amount would be too excessive, because, after all, we do not want to drive capitalists out of the country; we want them to come in, and if this great enterprise is going to develop in the proportions anticipated, and as the great consumers of iron ore will be supplied from this country, well then an enormous industry might develop out of what is now a comparatively small industry. It is an Inter-Empire organization and going to be maintained absolutely within the Empire and every pound of iron ore that comes from Bell Island will be kept within the Empire and the steel made will go towards British ships and to carry on British industries. Therefore, it is the duty of the Government to see to it that we ought not jeopardize our chances, but to get the best advantages we can. I throw out the suggestion that when the contract with this company is being made that provision be made for a minimum wage for miners working in the Bell Island mines. I think this is an opportunity that we have of providing for our miners for the future so that they will get sufficient for their work to keep them in comfort. There might be a thousand men there today, whereas if this enterprise progresses there will be three or four thousand men there within the next few years. It is the one bright ray of hope I see for the employment of our people, and it might have the effect of putting the hands of the clock back if the Government do not take this matter up promptly and come to an agreement regarding an enterprise that means so much for the future prosperity of this country. If the people who got to get the capital in Great Britain for this enterprise and they want to assess what tax they will have to pay to the Newfoundland Government it will put the whole project back for a few years, or perhaps destroy it altogether, if they have to wait unnecessarily for the answer. I am afraid that we do not know what the resources of this country really are. Our resources have been practically untouched and we have done hardly anything to find out what we have. We never made an honest or sincere effort to find out what is in the interior of this country. It's quite true that we developed a few mines around the sea-coast and every one of them were found to be rich in value. Well if it's true of those mines around the sea-coast, what of our vast interior trodden only by the fox, caribou and other wild animals and of which we know nothing. And I would suggest that in the appointment of a Geological Surveyor, as provided for in the Estimates at $5,000 a year, that the Government make it $10,000 and see that they get the best possible expert, the best man procurable in the United States, Great Britain or Canada, but preferably Canada or Great Britain. Give him a staff to go over this country and let him find out what we have, because it's the opinion of many eminent geologists that this country is abounding in minerals and that it only needs a scientist to make an intelligent search to find out where they lay. It would be money well spent and money that would eventually come back to the country a thousand fold. An instance of this is what Bell Island has done for Newfoundland and for Conception Bay in particular. If Bell Island were taken from Conception Bay it would be a place for everyone to leave. It's the backbone of the five or six districts surrounding that Island; and if it's true of Bell Island, it is equally

true of a dozen or more places thruout this country. We have coal areas opened up the past two years but there has been nothing done in a tangible way during all that period to expect any development of any commercial value. It would be a bright day for Newfoundland if we had our coal areas developed. It would make us independent for the working of our other industries, for the development of our mines as well as give an enormous amount of emplyoment to our people. We must not pay all attention to the fisheries of this country. I quite agree with the policy that the fisheries will be our mainstay for many years to come, but we got to grow and to try and get more for the people. The Estimates, as tabled, are not Over-Estimates for the requirements of the people. We cannot have too much for the people of this country. The fisheries is not an industry to attract outsiders, because they are not trained in it as they are in other industries and the sooner we can open other industries by which to attract outside capitalists the sooner we will be able to paddle our own canoe and able to maintain our independence as well as that of our children. If our fisheries fail we become helpless, because all our eggs are in the one basket, so to speak, and the consequence is that we become financially bankrupt, lose our independence and have to look to other means for subsistence. I do not contemplate any immediate danger of such a situation, but it may come quicker than we anticipate, and through stress of circumstances it may transpire in the not far distant future that we will wake up some fine morning and find the bottom gone out of the country with nothing but disaster and ruin staring us in the face. This can be obviated by launching on a policy of looking after the development of our other resources, because there is no other part of the British Empire that has greater resources and with greater possibilities than this old Colony of ours. I therefore hasten to express my disappointment that the Finance Minister should have thought fit to come in with such a presentation to the people of the country to fulfil a promise that was so well used with far-reaching affect as the reduction of taxation and the removal of the burdens from the taxpayers; you come in with a paltry, flimsy and contemptible document to wring another ten million dollars out of the people during the coming year.

MR. HIGGINS:—I do not intend to delay the House to any length. Just a few words I would like to say and I say them because of the principle that has always been adopted in the House that the Budget happens to be one of the occasions when the aspects of the Government's policy are brought forth and an occasion which affords an opportunity for commenting on various matters, as well as the tabling of the Estimates, the Budget and particularly the passing of the Ways and Means which form the last link in the trio representing public affairs in this country. This is an occasion on whch the community at large will look forward as to whether or not the Government's policy is to be realized and this is an occasion on which we are able to deliberate as to the real form and the aspect of our legislation as far as it concerns the public at large. This voting of Ways and Means, the passing of this vote is alone of consequence to the country. . It is easy enough to come in here and agree on the Estimates and decide as to the increases to be gfanted, but the thing is how this affects men outside and for which we are legally and mor-

ally responsible and that is the method adopted to collect that expendiure. It is easy for us to be here as an Opposition and either criticise or support the Government in coming in here and bringing down the Estimates as to what constitutes the public expenditure, and it is easy for the Government to vote all kinds of salaries for all sorts of reasons, and while it is very gratifying to have substantial increases voted all in this House, which are abnormal increases, but the man who has to pay the piper is one who is now concerned, and now as we have come to the time when we went into Ways and Means as to the method by which this taxation is to be levied and we have got to give serious thought as to how this paying is to be done under the circumstances. I recognize the principle and at the outset wish to say that so far as I am concerned I subscribe to the idea entirely, that this is a new Government and this is it's first Budget Speech, and as this is the Minister's first presentation of Ways and Means he is of necessity hampered, because he cannot be expected to be held responsible for what has happened for the year reviewed, nor can he be fairly held accountable for the balance of the year into which we have just entered and which had not come into review at the time the Budget Speech was made. But there is a period for which the Government will be directly responsible and that is the period which forms the third portion of the financial year and which ends June 30th, 1921, and as to that I wish to say a word. We do not blame the present Government for the Ways and Means for the payment of expenses of last year, or do I intend to find fault with the Government for considering Ways and Means for covering expenses, but I do say that some of the enormous duties and burdens of the Administrtation of the day is the undertaking of the responsibility of the Ways and Means for defraying expenses for the year upon which we are now just embarking, and unfortunately I have to say that the Government is not very happy as to the manner of its first levy upon the public, its first charge upon the Colony, its undertaking to collect the amount required to cover the Estimates which the Government has brought in. I have no fault to find with the members on the opposite side agreeing with the Government upon the Estimates brough in here, or for their not registering their objection to the methods of taxation necessary to be levied to meet these Estimates, but the Government cannot escape responsibility now placed upon them. There are two positions to which I propose to say a word. Firstly, as to the Estimates just practically terminated, and secondly to the method of paying this estimated amount of expenditure. Now the Finance Minister in his Budget Speech undertook to say that the extravagance of the late Government was mainly responsible for the increased expenditure, that surplus got down to $600,000 by June, 1920, and I think he is undertaking something unfortunate for himself, as I hope to be able to show in a moment, in becoming that absolute deciding factor as to the manner in which the revenue was lately expended and by inference of course takes unto himself the responsibility of being expected to sugegst improvements for his term of office upon which he is now embarking. There are a couple of paragraphs I wish to refer to. I know there are certain elements of the Government who will forget this serious business policy, but this is not cheap

newspaper clap-trap, and who will forget that is the wording of a paragraph or two in the Manifesto more or less, and who will forget that the Minister has fallen into language which has been used on previous occasions if you will bring your minds back to the speech of the leader of the Government when he went to the country a little while ago, and I venture to say that some of these paragraphs are copied from that speech. And in spite of this we are given to understand that this is the Budget Speech. Just listen to this (reads.) Now listen to the deductions made from this by the delightful financial Speech (reads). Now listen to this. You will remember in this connection the poor Minister of Marine and Fish has got to hold his tongue while these things are being said. Even if he is a dictator, I do not think in making this Budget Speech he could manufacture this kind of stuff because he is unfortunately in the position of being a member of the Government which is hereby assailed and it is his Government that did what this speaks of when that Administration was in office twelve months ago. Still the Finance Minister is coming in here and on behalf of the Government is seriously trying to impress us that it is a Reform Government, and that it will live up to it's name and under the guise of a lot of words draws attention to other people's misdeeds, forgetting unfortunately that the people are concerned not how much we talk about the misdeeds of other men or how much we repeat the story about grafters and boodlers which story is now becoming hackneyed, but what we do and will do ourselves, and the serious phase comes when we have to face back to those people in our districts who will tell us we are fed up with your talking about bye-gones and we are not concerned what other men did not do for us and what they did do for themselves, and we want to know what have you done for us and not what you have done for yourselves. We find that for those whom we represent we have done nothing but as far as we are concerned we like little men voted our salaries five times over, increased the ministerial pay considerably as well as the indemnity of those sitting in the Upper House and unfortunately we have followed the example of the grafters who proceeded us, but with the difference that the late Government impressed their bona fides upon the public by laying their cards upon the table.

It is often suggested that you need not be afraid of a man who comes along and says he is going to hit you in the face, or a pickpocket who tells you he is going to pick your pockets. But we have to take care of the new class. We have to look out for the Finance Minister's next budget. We find already that things are not as they seem. The Advocate use to have a whole column telling where the money goes. Who knows but that we will have a similar column showing where the money goes? I can tell you now where most of it is going. A fair share of it is going to be taken up by yourselves and your supporters. I never thought that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would be found in that class. We hoped that the day had come when we would have real economy. As far as this Government was concerned the greatest frugality was going to be exercised. But what has really occurred? We have only stopped increasing at the smallest things. We have voted anew in quarters where it was not required. The Minister stated in his opening paragraph:

Then look at another paragraph in

the same address: "To provide for the obligations

That is sensible, proper and right, but to come along in another paragraph and say that fluctations don't count, don't affect the earnings of our people, is but another instance that an attempt was made to make as good showing as possible. Does the Minister mean to suggest that if the earning power isn't so much the reserve will not be effected? Such would be an economist of the first order. But there can be no mincing matters on one point,—the attitude we are taking is the attitude of the people in general. Our view point is supposed to represent the view point of the public at large. The Government have got to admit our position, that to seriously say that there is any tariff reform in the program before us is saying too much to swallow. We heard last fall that this new Government was going to change all the conditions. A change can come about in only two ways,—you have got to have a tariff readjustment. It is pathetic to read that story, that big long paragraph in the Prime Minister's manifesto, wept over by the Prime Minister and his colleagues, and responded to with sobs by the Union members, that the heart's blood was wrung out of the people with taxation. To use the words of the Prime Minister "the people are groaning under the burden of taxation." We were told that there were only a quarter million people in the Island. We have the same quarter million people to-day, and no more. Now here is the serious proposal. I ask the Finance Minister if motor engines are coming in duty free, and he replies that they are not. But Bologna sausages are coming in duty free, and sausage skins are coming in duty free. You ought to import one big skin and stuff into it the whole crowd who had anything to do with compiling this unsavory budget. Is gasolene coming in duty free? No, it is not. What are the conditions under which kerosene is coming in duty free? We are told by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that the reason for that is so that we will have wooden packages for the purpose of exporting cod oil. But, if we are to believe the Minister, it is of dubious worth to the fishermen because of the leakage. Instead of making a reduction in that form it would have been much better to grant a bonus for making packages for the exportation of cod oil. That would have some effect in reducing the high cost of living.

The Minister says in his budget speech: "The necessities of life will have the minimum of taxation, and the luxuries the maximum of taxation." Bologna sausage will have the minimum of taxation. We will have to call this the Bologna Sausage Government, and the Minister of Finance and Customs the Bologna Sausage Minister. Let all hands young and old go out and eat Bologna sausages and sausage skins. We are seriously told by the Finance Minister that we are going to have sausage skins free of duty. My own experience with sausages is to the effect that sausages all depend upon the maker. I hesitate lately to eat sausages for the reason that there is a sausage meat put up and coming here that is absolutely unfit for human consumption. It contains all kinds of rubbish; but that is the stuff that the people are going to get in with the minimum of taxation. Heretofore the Germans were known to be the only sausage eaters, but now Newfoundlanders are going to be the only sausage eaters. Mr. Abbott will be coming back a year from now with a German face and a sausage stomach. It is rumored around town that the Minister of Finance likes sausages. I was wondering what the reason was for his German face. Then there is Mr. Foote,

and Mr. Cave, and Mr. Winsor, they all look like good sasage eaters. I don't believe that Mr. Jennings likes them. I knew, sir, that you wouldn't eat that vile stuff. My friend, Mr. Guppy, is not here. I would like to know what he has to say about Bologna sausages. We can't eat agricultural implements, books, or cattle feed, and the funny thing about the whole situation is that the only thing used as human food on the free list is Bologna sausages. That is what the Government calls placing the burden of taxation on the shoulders where it belongs. Next session we will come in and ask the Finance Minister to whom were all the sausages sent. If I had my way the man who would eat Bologna sausages would be shot. That is what the Government is going to call tariff readjustment. It would be better for the Minister and the Government to say we can't do anything, and all that talk we had during election time about tariff readjustment was only election talk to deceive the voters. If the Government were honest that is what they would say. Now that the election is over and even Mr. Cave is back that kind of thing comes on the one hand, and on the other hand there is no reference whatever as to what is going to be done with the surplus. We are told what Mr. Hoover says, and the outlook of the President of the Bank of Montreal, but there is not a word as to the handling of the railroad situation. Everybody knows that some of the surplus will have to be devoted for that purpose, or a year from now the whole thing will be blown to pieces.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Chairman, before the political curtain rings down on the closing scene of the first act of the tragedy being staged by the Bologna Sausage Government, I wish to have a word with regard to the financial program of the gentleman who has assumed the leading role. This tragedy was begun last August when the present Prime Minister announced his intention to lead a party in the political field, and I am sorry that he is not in the House to-night. In the introductory paragraph of his manifesto to the people he said amongst other things, "In 1917 I visited Canada in the interest of the National Government and my trip was of great value." Of course it was. It was an arrangement of great value to the gentleman who made the trip. I was away at the time and I had no knowledge of the fact that this patriot had received the sum of $2,500 as payment for his services until the Leader of the Opposition, Sir Michael Cashin, informed us of it this evening, and indeed we have reason to believe that this has not been all that he received in connection with that trip. What I do not understand is why, for work done in 1917, he should have waited until 1920 for payment. Now sir, I remember men who made trips abroad that kept them away from their business and from their private affairs for months, but they did not receive anything like this amount paid to the Hon. R. A. Squires. Mr. Bennett made a much more extended trip which cost the Colony only $1,000 and every reasonable minded man will admit that he was put to considerably greater expense than was the Prime Minister. Sir William Lloyd visited England on the occasion of the Imperial Conference and he did not get anything like what Mr. Squires received in the instance we are now discussing. I wouldn't mind so much but for the fact that this is the same man who denounced graft so strongly and who was going to reform the country when he attained power. Well, if this is reform, I hope we will not see any more of it. He goes on in this document with what to my mind was an attractive program of the great things he was going to do, and I do not blame the

people for being deceived by it, but just let us turn the search light on it for a moment, or as my friend Mr. Devine used to say, let us put it on the operating table and apply the dissecting knife. The first matter dealt with is Public Health, a very important question and one that required readjustment. Regarding this, the Prime Minister pointed out the need for hospital extention. He knew well enough what the people wanted and what they would therefore most readily fall for, but he had no intention of following out this program because if he did, we would not be here to-day voting amounts the expenditure of which was never forecasted in his manifesto while the very first matter to be found on its pages was being absolutely ignored. There is not one district clear of St. John's sufficiently supplied with hospital accommodation and as I informed this House only a short time ago, there were then eight hundred applications in from persons waiting to get admittance to the General Hospital, and surely this must have been known to the leader of the Government and to his Executive yet, knowing it, they come in here and vote money for themselves and every other unnecessary purpose that one could think of and these unfortunate people who were deceived by their flowery promises are relegated to the background in a matter which to them was and is of the first importance.

The second item of importance in this program, or one that was believed to be second in importance was that of homes for working men, and in this at least the Government has done something, they have found positions for some of the men identified with the project but the people who required most and who were led to expect most got absolutely nothing. The Government put this off by means of the bill which we had before the House a few days ago and which means nothing to the solving of the housing problem and nothing will be heard of this matter till some future date when it is wanted again for political purposes.

Another matter dealt with is Public Charities and right here I want to congratulate the writer of that manifesto on knowing so well the subjects that would most strongly appeal to the people. Nothing is done however, and the widow and orphan are left to paddle their own canoe. Perhaps when the curtain is about to ring down on the final scene of the last act of this tragedy, the Government will come in here, and as a death bed repentance, will ask for a substantial vote for this purpose so that they may catch the votes of the friends of those then remaining but the maintenance of those unfortunate people is not considered in the meantime. I think, sir, that it is nothing to the credit of those who sanctioned the increases in their own salaries while to the dependants of those who have contributed in the largest measure to the wealth of this country they give nothing. The answer to it is that the widow has no vote nor has the orphan a vote and for that reason we are prepared to ignore them. The next matter is tuberculosis. What has been done in this? True some provision is being made to deal with it in the city, and anyone who has friends in high places may have special provision made but in several sections of the country there are hundreds suffering from this dread disease for whom there is nothing done. If you were to increase the proposed expenditure for this purpose by five hundred per cent, there is not a man on this side of the House who would raise an objection. As things stand at present, Dr. Rendell has not the means at his disposal for dealing adequately with this vital matter and the Government is doing nothing to help him in any way. Substan-

tial votes have been made to trade and commerce, education, marine and fisheries and I must say I have not as yet lot all confidence in the gentleman who is the incumbent of that office and as in the Fish Regulations, I am prepared to give him a fair chance till the House meets again. If during the intervening time he lives up to his promises in the interests of the people, I will be prepared to get up in my place in this House and do him full justice and if on the contrary he fails to do his duty in this respect I will not hesitate to denounce him.

And now we come to taxation, which formed one of the chief planks in the platform of the leader of the Government when he went to the country, and which has been so cleverly and humorously dealt with by the member for St. John's East, Mr. Higgins. I think I can assure the Minister of Finance and Customs that his budget is, without exception, the most disappointing document ever delivered to the people of this country. You have reduced the taxes on manures, printing paper, sand and clay and on sausages. I also noticed that you have reduced the two dollars which you collected last year on wheat. Now Mr. Chairman, instead of reducing the burden which the Prime Minister in his manifesto said was bearing on the poor people who toil from morn till night this is what you have to offer. I quite agree with the statement that the burden bears heavily on the poor people and I now want to assure the Prime Minister that the poor people are not prepared to swallow this. Instead of decreasing the cost of living you have added another $10.00 per head more than they had to pay in 1919 through the increased cost of living brought about by the reform party. The manifesto of the Prime Minister told of the horrible conditions under which labour was existing in Newfoundland; now what do we find in the Government programme in regard to this subject. They spoke of a department of labour but in replying to a question asked the Prime Minister told us that there was going to be no such department created. It was not thought of sufficient importance. Last fall the present government party cried down bitter tears because of the conditions existing among the labouring classes of this country. It was a very good vote catcher but like all other promises that they have made it remains a vote catcher and nothing has been done to improve the conditions. When labour organized in the west end so as to cause a split vote and allow the election of the Prime Minister and his colleagues the extent of the interest shown by the present government was such as to allow the appointment of one of the candidates in a civil department and no doubt the recompensation of the others. This kind of stuff won't work any more. The working classes of this country are not prepared to be hoodwinked and fooled by the few at the expense of the many. On the strength of all this the Prime Minister is elected and comes in here and votes himself many thousands of dollars and if the Labrador boundary question is going to be probed by him for the next two years at $2500 a week you can figure out what he will get. If he holds that office for the next four years he will be worth $100,000 easily. I regret that the Prime Minister is not in the House to-night, I don't want him to come in here to-morrow and say that I was taking advantage of his absence to expose him. He should be here to give an account of his stewardship. I don't care who it is that does wrong I am prepared to expose him. But really it is only waste of energy and valuable time to try and induce the government to make an honest attempt to fulfill the pledges handed out to the

people last fall. I believe that the personnel of the government never intend to present themselves to the country again. They are making hay while the sun shines. The sun is shining now but the storm will very soon burst. The ministers and members of this House who have heard the many pleas that I have placed forward time and again for the widows and orphans must never intend to go back to seek re-election again.

In reference to the high cost of living I notice that the government are handling it in a practical way and in a way that the merchant is making fortunes at the expense of the poor. The clerk who works for the monthly wage is hit the very hardest; the man who works for the day's pay, the stipulated amount. The profiteer who is flourishing to-day on Water Street and flourished during the war is flourishing to-day to a far greater extent and the legislation you have asked us to pass is that connection is just as much a farce as the housing problem. These men have nothing to fear from the present administration. You have said to yourselves we will make the taxpayer, the farmer and the fisherman pay his share but we won't touch or interfere with the profiteers, because they have said if you don't interfere with us we won't interfere with you. As sure as the sun rises to-morrow morning the people of this country will soon have their eyes open to the fact and they will soon be asking what is doing. Only the Hand of Providence can save us from bankruptcy. If there's going to be a bad fishery this year where are we going to find ourselves. The clergy of Canada have publicly denounced from the pulpit the criminal scandal of increasing the stipends of the members of the House at Ottawa at the expense of the best blood of the country. Some say that we are very glad to get ours. We might be glad under normal conditions but I am not glad to receive mine under the present conditions. Now what is being done for the men whom you have talked about in the manifesto as "Our Boys." They were our boys when they were wanted to vote but they are not our boys now, they are "these fellows." I wouldn't like to predict what would happen in this country if Great Britain had to go to war to-morrow in defense of the same freedom and the same justice that they responded to in 1914. I do not think that the same rally to the flag would be repeated in 1920 because of the criminal neglect of the present administration. Practically all the positions that have been filled since the government have come into power have been filled by party camp followers.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—That's not true.

MR. WALSH:—It is true, and I can prove it. Is the secretary to the Finance Minister a returned soldier? Is the secretary to the Minister of Fisheries a returned soldier? Ah no, they are like scores of other political heelers. I can name many of my own constituents who have returned from the war maimed for the balance of their lives; some applied for positions and were turned down, while new positions were created for political trumpeters. One, an ex-R.N.R., who was here when peace was proclaimed after spending four years on active service and who applied for a position and was refused and who is to-day in the United States. His last words to me on leaving here were "If we get a repetition of 1914 you will have to look somewhere else for men to man the ships. Now I don't say that in any spirit of being unpatriotic. I have been accused of not having done my duty in the recruiting campaign. It is true that in 1917 the Chairman of the Patriotic Committee asked me to go round Placentia Bay on

a recruiting trip and not considering the matter rightly I said that I would go but after consideration I didn't go.

MR. FOX:—In days gone by, particularly during the general election campaign last, I have heard the expression "Hunnish methods" as applied to the tactics of the present Government for unduly criticising the present Opposition who were then the Government. Now the action of the new Reform Government is not alone Hunnish, but the members thereof Huns and Germans for their deliberate attempt to Germanize Newfoundland. They have attempted to foist Germar food on the people of this country and turn us into sausage eaters. But in this they think they have not gone far enough to complete the diet table, because the Germans give their people sausages and beer, but this Government says to the people of Newfoundland, "We are going to give you sausages but we are not going to give you any beer." They started out to give us free sausage, but they took jolly good care that their loud-mouthed and much looked forward to promise concerning prohibition would not be fulfilled. Here we have in Newfoundland the majority of the electorate expectantly waiting for the Government, which was returned to power and won its election in a large measure by its promise to reform prohibition, to do some thing in this connection. But, unfortunately, the Government has not the courage of its convictions to bring down this present session a bill replacing that highly indecent, unjust and reprehensible Act, known as the Prohibition Law. Words are not strong enough to condemn the present measure in existence. I think that the Government is negligent and derelict in their duty on behalf of the people, because one of the principal promises that they were determined to carry out when they went to the country last Fall was to remedy this intolerable state of affairs, under the present Prohibition Act. Why the whole thing is a sham from start to finish. You stated that you were going to attempt to save the people and to save the half hundred men who had not sufficient control of their appetites. I venture the assertion to-night that the very men, with few exceptions, who set out to bring about Prohibition are the very persons who have been making a regular bonanza out of that Act financially as well as being in a position to get all the liquor they want to consume themselves. We have decent respectacle citizens suffering to-night and by the exercise of their own free will, because they are denied the privilege that a free living citizen is entitled to And even my good friend the hon. member for Placentia intimated that he believed that the would be Premier who compiled that Manifesto was sincere. No, sincerity is not made of that stuff. I ask this House and this country to-night what evidence has the Leader of the Government given of his protestations and promises of Reform last year. Prohibition, as at present carried out, is a farce and a sham and a iniquitous measure and I expected that the new Government would not be in office long before this evil thing would be killed for ever in this Newfoundland of ours. We should give the decent citizen the right to exercise his free right and his free will. This country thinking that the Government of the day were sincere in the promise that they made last Fall in this respect, went to work and four weeks ago sent a petition to this House, signed by twenty thousand of the free men of this Island, but the Government takes no notice of that. Well, as a result, we have to-night a disgraceful conditions of affairs going on, which the Government, though its Prime Minister promised to remedy, and Newfound-

land, especially St. John's is being turned into a veritable dope centre. And the Government are largely to blame at present for allowing this to continue as it is by their inaction to exercise their powers of control, and any body of men who will complacently look on and allow our manhood to become degenerates are not fit to be called a Government. I cannot protest too strongly against this iniquitous measure; not alone is it wrong on principle, but it is heinous in the effect that it is having upon the people. You have succeeded in closing the bars, I admit; you have succeeded in putting into an early grave people who needed liquors for medical purposes and you have succeeded in putting thousands of people in the town that I was born in into degenerates. You have not the courage to tell the people that this iniquitous measure is wrong and admit that it is wrong. No wonder that you have got an extension on your Lunatic Asylum and mark my words that if you allow this condition to continue much longer that you will have to build so many asylums that it will be found that the general revenue of the Colony will be insufficient to keep up. Ask Dr. Campbell, the late colleague of the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister, what the effect of dope is upon the human system and the human brain. So degenerating has the dope habit become in our midst that I have seen, in my experience around the Magistrate's Court, cases in which men refused a drink of decent liquor for a drink of dope stuff. And the fault of all that lies at the doors of the present administration.

Now who wants Bologna sausage without beer, as Mr. Higgins said. As a matter of fact one would want something to drink as a chaser after using such an inferior article of diet as Bologna sausage. Vanilla will not take away the disgusting taste. You may laugh, but this country is facing a serious position when it is saddled by an Act which the people do not want and the Government know it, and still the Government did its work best on the evil tenor of its way. In protesting against this iniquitous measure I do not reflect upon the gentlemen who were its creators and who started the Prohibition movement in this country, because I believe that they had a sincere desire to remedy the conditions that then existed, but I say that most of them gentlemen never anticipated an unfair measure as this. Italked this matter over with the most ardent prohibition people and they were one with me on this point. The Minister of Finance talks about the preservation of our forest wealth and backs up his statements by lengthy quotations from gentlemen eminently qualified to talk. I will quote for the information of the House the exact words used by the Minister in his Budget in dealing with this matter. (Reads quotation).

Three hundred million dollars is stated as the potential earning power for the labourers of this Dominion and yet the Government vote the paltry sum of $20,000 for fire patrol, which would a little more than pay the salary of a competent man to look after this class of work. During the last six weeks we had numerous forest fires all round the country that did damage to the extent of some hundreds of thousands of dollars. This destruction was caused in a large measure by the negligence of the Government who comes along with this hypocritical statement about the potential earning power of our labourers. This rosy promise to our labourers by the Government ddi its work best on the eve of the election. What other countries would do, realizing, as we should, what a magnificent asset it is to have such a vast forest of resources, is to set out systematically

and patrol that country and not depend upon a half dozen fire wardens to go over a few hundred miles and not depend upon rain to quench fires when they start.

We cannot hope to derive the proper income if the prices go down. On the question of expenditure you are not taking into account the loss Newfoundland is going to suffer on the one hundred thousand quintals of fish unsold in European markets. We have been told that there are two hundred thousand quintals of fish unsold here and in the European markets and on the authority of a competent person as to the trade of the Colony I can say and I believe that the country is going to suffer and the price of fish will be $6.00 per quintal. What amount is there on the loss of fish shipped since last November? On the competent authority of this gentleman, I am assured that the loss to Newfoundland will not be less than one half million dollars on fish shipped since last November. Have you ben taking into account that deficit? Have you taken into account the deficit on salt? The Government paraded before the country, before the electors of the Dominion, saying they were going to take off their shoulders the present burden, or to use their own phraseology, "the laborers of the country would have their taxation lessened by $50,000." If salt is to be imported and distributed to the people at a loss, of course, you are not going to take the credit for this, for you are merely robbing Peter to pay Paul. Every cent of that $50,000 will be paid by every mother's son of us in Newfoundland. If I am an employee and I rob my employer of $50,000 I am responsible for it. You cannot take the credit of a loss of that sum because it is paid to the fisherman. In every phase of public life when the salt situation was critical in the past it was dealt with with foresight, and if this had been done during this year Newfoundland need not suffer this loss of $50,000, and instead of taking credit for that magnificent act of public charity you ought to hang your heads in shame. It is amazing that such incompetence and incapacity should be displayed on your part. And I noticed in going over the manifesto of the leader of the House a lot of talk about the public charity to be shown to the people of ewfoundland. But as far as I can see you have been charitably disposed to put your charitable hands upon your charitable hearts any pay $28,000 to yourselves. This is the public charity of the so-called Liberal Reform Government in advancing to protect ourselves and that is the extent of that great big talked-of charity. You have not done one cent's worth of good to the poor worn-out fishermen of the country the men who spent the best part of their lives and who cannot work now. How can they exist on $150 per year? But here today you are advancing the ministerial pay four hundred per cent. And then you talk of the largeness of heart and the spirit of public charity. In the early part of this session when we were only having five o'clock conversations with you gentlemen, when we were merely exchanging pleasantries, you accused us of holding up the proceedings of this House. If any of us on this side get up and talk about vital matters, the gentlemen on the other side twitch like hens on hot bricks. Meet a member of the other side and he will tell you he is home-sick and wishes to get there to attend to his business; he will say that he cannot remain here for five weeks while the fish season is on and that he never heard such talk as came from the Op-

position benches for the past five weeks, and then suddenly the gentlemen opposite are gifted with the valuable gift of appreciation. If after all they recognize that we were learned and were throwing pearls of wisdom at their feet and they were willing to sit more contentedly and more attentive to the doings of the House, and perhaps they may wonder if there is something else the others take notice of and we do not at any rate it suddenly dawned on them like a flash and the news is heralded to everyone that their sessional pay is one thousand dollars. Now we are content to remain four months because we nipped the public treasury and advanced ourselves what the leader of the House would call public charity. I for one protest against being paid to come here to perform a public duty. I regard it as an honor and a privilege to be sent here by the people of the district I have the honor to represent, and I regard it as a direct insult to come in here in an attempt to protect the interests of the people dole us out some dirty dollars by the way of solatium. You thereby place the Legislature of Newfoundland in the unenviable position of paying its members and then over-paying them for doing their duty. This duty should be an honor for them to perform. Take that tweney-eight thousand dollars which the members of the House of Assembly aren't entitled to, and give it to the orphans and widows and worn-out fishermen and distribute the money amongt the men who died and bled for you. If you had done this I would take off my hat to you for displaying such a mangnificence of spirit, but instead you have denied those objects of public charity and you have gratuitously given yourselves the money and you have turned your backs upon the people who look to you for the upholding of their rights, and you have gone far from handling matters on a moral scale. The whole thing is a scandal from beginning to end. You have been hypocritical, as you have built your plans upon the shifting sands. You cannot tell me that any good is coming from the Government we have to-day. The present Government has discarded and overlooked all that is sacred in the Administration that has at heart the promotion and safeguard of the interests of those whom it is in duty bound to protect. The only thing the Administration of the day can boast of is the protection of their own interests first. I am surprised. I did really expect better. I will not be surprised if the people of Newfoundland will wake up and turn out of office the Government who were presumed to be all business ability and who were substituted for a bunch of grafters, but after all they substituted a group of novices, whose only interest at heart is self.

MR. MacDONNELL:—During' yesterday's debate I ventured to make some comment and the Minister of Finance told me I was no business man. Still the Minister of Marine and Fisheries said yesterday that the Trading Company was to be recouped by the Food Control Board for some loss owing to the lack of business knowledge and action in reference to the importation of sugar. I presume the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is a good business man. And he is the dominating spirit in this Government all the good business instinct has permeated every branch of the Government I suppose. But still since the Government has taken office that idea of good busines has not been adopted as regards

the promises made the people of Newfoundland last Fall. If they have fulfilled the promises contained in the manifesto of the leader of the House they have shown no proof of it. They have not in any way justified the repose of the peoples confidence and I cannot but believe he was sincere when he made those promises. Those things were held up in that manifesto, I am afraid, with some indifference which has characterized the doings of the present Administration, and we have been justified in our criticism that they have been very prominent with their promises because of the absence of the evidence of performance. I do not preach myself to be a political economist in all things, although the Minister is one, yet I have studied the subject for four years. They have four years ahead of them, but I think they will prove experts in promising but failures in practice. You were talking about how the late Government were extravagant during their period of control and they were continually described as a bunch of grafters that will never be worse in this country, and that the Government was not of the people by the people and for the people, but it was a Government that stood for tyranny and despotism. The present Government was not going to fall into the ruts of its predecessors, but already they have fallen and they find themselves in the mire which a short time ago they simply loathed. This Government was going to lighten the burdens of the people, but we find the free entry list comes to a total sum of $66,000 and that is the reduction of taxation we were promised. If this is the extent of the reduction of taxation every person in this country is saved yearly 27 cents. Now against this we have an increase of taxation of two million dollars, which means that every person in this country is taxed more than ever—about eight dollars per head. So instead of having a lessening of the taxation we have been given an increase to the extent of $7.73 for every man, woman and child in the country, and this is how they have fulfilled their promises to lighten the load on every man, I want to know why this is and why in face of all the talk of the leader of the Government, motor engines for the use of the fishermen are not included in this list, and why do they make the promise that motor engines for the use of the fishermen will come in duty free as soon as they came to power? Why is it not done? What has the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to say with regard to this? If that is the idea of the Government I think they are starting on the paid to put the engine for the use of the fishermen on the free list. They also promised that gasolene for use in these engines should also come in numerous promises unfulfilled. Can anyone explain to us the reason of it all? Do you want to discourage the general success of the fisheries of this country while time is given to work out the salvation of some pet plan? That is the only reason or excuse. The duty of twenty cents on split herring is to be taken off. Well might the Government take this off as it was a War Tax. The best price now obtainable over in St. George's for herring is $3.50 per barrel, and by the time you figure out the cost of salt and the package very little is left, and still we are forced to consider the Regulations brought in by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and he is prepared to take the chance I hope they will be justifiable. The herring fishery has amounted to one million dollars and still it is not considered to be of any importance what-

ever. Nothing has been done to keep the herring industry up. Well might the Government take twenty cents off the Export Duty. I suppose there are no big followers to pack split herring. We heard during the discussion by Mr. Fox the relation by him of a new story. I am wondering if there is any collusion between Mr. Fox and the Minist er of Fisheries. And the reason is this: There has been on the agenda for a number of days a Bill entitled "The Keeping of Dogs," and I wonder if the Minister brought in that Act to have all the skins after canning up all the dogs of the country. I know that in some foreign countries there are gratings and when the dog steps on it he disappears. Mr. Hibbs the other day said he wanted our photos for some plan, but I think he ought really get our photos and put them on all the jam crocks and call the whole thing the Jam Crock Government. So this is what we get from what should be the decent government. I also see nails, etc., are to come in slightly reduced. They will be very useful for times coming. The people who should have concerned this Government get no place whatever. I suppose that Commission which was considering the Railway is still considering it. They are a long time sitting on those eggs but still they are not hatched out yet. Another of the promises of the Government was the improvement of the roads and bridges and there was supposed to be set aside a large special grant for the pioneers in road making, and only a couple of days ago the Prime Minister admitted in the House that the people of St. George's required more than a per capita grant for their requirements up there as regards road-making, but when you will have to face them again you will not be able to say you fulfilled that promise, but you will have all you can do to answer why you increased their taxation $7.73. They have paid their dollars as well as every other section of the country still they have not a single branch railway, and if you cannot see your way clear to build a branch railway, the least thing you may do is to give them a decent main line road. And now we are to be consoled to know that we are to get in Bologna Sausage for nothing. This will prove to be of meagre solace to the people of St. George's when they have to wade through bogs and rivers and through the terrible highways of their district because of the great lack of proper roads, and instead of carrying out your promise in a proper business like way you come in and say Bologna Sausages and Jam Crocks will come in duty free. You, in common with us, made those promises, it is true, but still I am not impeded from holding you responsible for their fulfillment. I had hoped too for greater land bonuses. I have many times asked those to be granted particularly in the farming sections of the country, and I trusted that my remarks may remind the Government and that it would take up the consideration of it. But the only result is the Model Farm, which I have never seen and never will see, and which will never be seen by one-fifth of the people of the country, and that is the result of that Department which represents nobody in this country nor Nova Scotia. I have on several occasions pointed out, the way to reduce the High Cost of Living was to have increased production. The Government promised that, on the immediate entry into office, the conditions causing the High Cost of Living would have its first and careful attention. I know what I am talking about. I was one of those in common who

made that promise and I am holding you responsible for the non-performance of it. In connection with the Housing Scheme, the leader of the House when depicting Sir Michael Cashin's attitude towards it said that Sir Michael Cashin marked "Nothing doing" on the agenda when the matter was referred to the late Executive for consideration. Well, this Government may be truthfully termed not alone the Bologna Sausage Government, the Jam Crock Government, but one may rightly add the "Do Nothing" Government. The Food Control Board has fleeced the public under the new Administration and where the present Government has not made a mistake it has done nothing whatever.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—Mr. Speaker I have listened to the various speakers with interest. I look upon this first Budget, sir, as an insult. You did not even have a copy printed for the members. We have to get it from a newspaper. Mr. Brownrigg can't sit down and take his medicine, and evidently the Prime Minister thought it was all over because he just came into the House. When I opened the Speech from the Throne I saw some-$20,000, but that was put there only because of Honorable John Anderson. It doesn't seem to me that Mr. Coaker and the union candidates are taking their medicine. We have three factions in the Government now—Mr. Coaker, Mr. Warren and Mr. Squires. Now we have Mr. Squires' manifesto and Mr. Brownrigg's Budget Speech with bologna sausages the only article of food on the free list. You have called us Sinn Feiners but when we come back to the House next session we will be fighting the Germans on the other side of the House, because they will be Germans after eating sausages.

Mr. Brownrigg has become famous because of this Budget. We are going to get jam crocks free of duty. I remember we used to get jam crocks with a picture on them. The man's name was John Gray. Now we are going to have jam crocks with Mr. Brownrigg's picture on them. The Prime Minister was going to lessen the burden of the poor people and put it on the rich. This is how he is doing it. Has he taken the duty ofi molasses, flour and boots?

I passed some remarks the other day in the House and when I found a copy of those remarks I noticed that the reporter had typed a few of the words and then he said that the rest was "all bosh." I also heard that the reporters were asked to cut down the Opposition speeches. If the reporter now in the box wishes to think that this is bosh he can put that down as well. There has been so many queer things done lately that even this does not surprise me. We have heard a lot about the boodlers and grafters during the election campaign. It was all written over the newspapers and I began to wonder who the real boodlers and grafters and robbers were, and today I have found out. They are over there from the Prime Minister down. The Hon. leader of the Opposition stated the other night that the Prime Minister had received $2500 for work done in 1917 and he also said, though he was not sure, that the Prime Minister was previously paid for that same work.

HON. PRIME MINISTER: —The Governor-in-Council passed a resolution granting me courtesy and thanks for work well and favorably done.

MR. VINNICOMBE:—Oh, I guess you got paid all right. In referring to some remarks passed the other day on Prohibition, I know that the Prime Minister went into the beer shops in St. John's West during the election campaign and called for drinks for

the crowd, and he told them that he always took a drink, and he told them that when he got into power something would be done to remedy the conditions that were then existing, but they haven't the courage of their convictions to do anything. They will probably form a committee of anti-prohibitionists and prohibitionists and they will get together in the court house and have a talk over it and they will disagree and that will finish the prohibition question. There is no man here who would dare give his honest and candid opinion of this question. There's a good many men on the Government side of the House that I wouldn't trust with a bottle of Black and White. I know Mr. Jennings can take his little drop like he took his thousand dollars, and there are lots of men there like him. Now about this Budget. The Minister of Finance came in here last week and slapped a copy of it on the table and today we can't find it, and when you want it you have to go look for it. There is the Squires' Manifesto and the Coaker Manifesto and the Warren Manifesto. I know all about the Warren Manifesto, because he was forming his own party and he was going to ask Mr. Coaker for his support. I pity Mr. Squires over there if they are supporting one another. I am sorry that the Minister of Finance isn't here., I cant find a copy of the Budget. I guess I will have to look for a copy of the Star or the Advocate when I want to read the Budget. I much prefer the Advocate. I notice the duty has been taken off wheat so that the Flat Island men can make moon-shine; that is what they use, and they also use molasses. That is what we will have to drink here soon, molasses. They said they were also going to take the duty off oil. That's their finish; they are going to oil, anyway. They say they are not going to take the duty off steel barrels, but off wooden barrels, because we are getting short of barrels to ship our own oil in. I think that is an insult to the coopers of the country. A company was started here four years ago and they sold oil for 13 cents a gallon, but just as they got their camp pitched they started to skin the people and today you have to pay them 40 cents a gallon. Tobacco today is a luxury. There is not a fisherman in this country to-day hardly who does not smoke or chew, and many of them buy as much as 25 cents worth of tobacco each day. Now why does the Government not take the duty off tobacco. These men can't do without tobacco like some men can't do without rum. Some of our ancestors were reared on rum and molasses. I notice that one of the members is after falling asleep over there. I notice that there is still no sign of the Minister of Finance, and in regard to that Budget I don't think that he will ever make a fortune off it. No wonder that cat would run across the House. You can go ahead and make your sausages now.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Who is in charge of that Bill?

HON. PRIME MINISTER:—The Minister of Finance. Shall I call him in?

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Don't you think it would be the decent thing?

MR. HIGGINS:—I think that this is the first time that the Committe has sat on Ways and Means in this House and nothing has been done to answer the views expressed by the members on the Opposition side of the House, and I would like also to thank the Government for their good grace and sense not to attempt a justification of

the hopes that have been held out to the country. I would ask the Ministers to go out and fortify themselves by eating a good feed of bologna sausage or sausage skins, or may some of the skins be filled up and given to the members to put some spirit in them. There are many of them perhaps, like myself, who have never yet mustered up sufficient courage to sample it, who may do so now and go back to their districts and tell the electors that they have placed bologna sausage on the free list. I am sure the country at large will appreciate this action of the Government and that regulations will be issued for the curing and proper handling of bologna sausage, so that we may be sure we will not do that great food any wrong. This Government will go down in history as the "Bologna Sausage Government."

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:— Some days ago the senior member for St. John's East, Mr. Higgins, read a telegraph message which he had received from some friend in the District of Bay de Verde in which the sender of the message made a charge against the Postal Telegraph officials saying that a telegraph message sent to Mr. Puddester had been made public by the telegraph operator. I asked Mr. Higgins as to whether the charge which he was making against the honor of the telegraph official was based upon information obtained from a reliable source. Mr. Higgins replied that he would not disclose the name of the sender of the message, but that he was a reliable person. I then assured him that a full investigation would be made. I immediately wrote the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs who promptly, namely, on June 18th, sent the following memorandum to Superintnedent Stott:

General Post Office,
St. John's, Newfoundland,
June 18th, 1920.

MEMO TO SUPT. STOTT.

Attached is a copy of a letter received from the Prime Minister respecting the charge made in the Assembly that a message telephoned from Salmon Cove to the telegraph office at Carbonear addressed to J. C. Puddester, Northern Bay, was given unauthorized publicity on Tuesday night at Salmon Cove. You will observe that the Prime Minister desires that this matter be fully investigated.

MIN. POSTS & TELEGRAPHS.

Superintendent Stott replied to Mr. Halfyard under date June 19th, which letter was forwarded to me on the same day by Mr. George W. LeMessurier on behalf of the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs. The correspondence referred to is as follows:

Newfoundland Postal Telegraphs,
(Copy)

Superintendent's Office,
St. John's, N.F.,
June 19th, 1920.

Hon. W. W. Halfyard,
Minister.

Sir,

Concerning your memo of the 18th instant, I find, on inquiry, that we received a message at Carbonear on the 15th from the United Towns Electrical Co. The message originated at Salmon Cove telephone office and was addressed J. C. Puddister, Northern Bay. Our Carbonear operator finding that Mr. Puddister was at Lower Is. Cove, forwarded the message to Lower Island Cove where it was promptly delivered to Mr. Puddister who paid our tolls on same.

I find there are eight telephones on this wire including central, from Carbonear to Broad Cove.

Attached please find inquiry papers.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,

Your obedient servant,
(Signed) DAVID STOTT,
Superintendent.

Encs.
(Copy)

General Post Office,
St. John's, Newfoundland,
June 19th, 1920.

Hon. R. A. Squires, K.C.,
Prime Minister,
St. John's.

Sir,

I have the honour to enclose a letter of even date from Supt. Stott, in reference to a message from Salmon Cove to Mr. J. C. Puddister, addressed to him at Northern Bay, and delivered to him at Lower Island Cove without delay.

This message was sent by the United Towns' Electrical Company's telephone system from Salmon Cove to Carbonear, on which line there are eight telephones, operated by persons who are not in the employ or under the control of the Postal Telegraphs and, as far as I know, not responsible to any Department of the Government, and under the circumstances, I submit that more definite charges should be made and proved before blame is attached to the Postal Telegraphs.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) GEO. W. LeMESSURIER,
For Min. of Posts & Telegraphs.

I may say that in addition to this official inquiry I made an inquiry on the spot. I found that the sender of the message was Mr. C. E. Russell, of Bay Roberts. Mr. Russell was employed by the Opposition as a campaigner against Mr. W. H. Cave in the District of Bay de Verde. Mr. Russell's habit was to follow Mr. Cave around, go to all his meetings, and then send reports, usually false reports, around the District as to the sort of meeting Mr. Cave had and the reception he got. In this particular case Mr. Russell wanted to send a telegraph message to Mr. Puddester, telling Mr. Puddester about a conversation which Mr. Russell said he had with Mr. Cave and some other matters, the message being an absolute misrepresentation of facts. The message was not handed by Mr. Russell to any telegraph office. It was telephoned by Mr. Russell over the United Towns Electrical Company telephone system. He used a public wire on which there were eight telephones besides central. At the time he took down the receiver two subscribers were on the line. Mr. Russell started out his conversation in the following words "This is Mr. C. E. Russell, J.P." and then gave his message. The message being over the public wires and of political significance was common property within the course of a few minutes. Both persons who were at the 'phone made a note of the message, one sending a copy, insofar as he was able to get it accurately from the telephone conversation, by motor car to Mr. Cave, who was holding a meeting in a neighbouring town. The message to Mr. Cave came from a telephone station many miles away from the place where Mr. Russell telephoned the message and many miles away from Carbonear. There was absolutely no leakage whatever so far as the Telegraph system was concerned and the attack of the honourable member upon the Postal Telegraph officials was entirely without justification.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

And it being past midnight.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed certain resolutions and recommended that a Bill be introduced to give effect to the same.

On motion this report was received and adopted and 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.

The remaining orders of the day were deferred.

Mr. Fox gave notice of question.

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled report of the Auditor General on Municipal Accounts.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

WEDNESDAY, July 7th, 1920.

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

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I ask leave to present a petition from the residents of Hermitage and the nearby places asking that a Magistrate be appointed at Hermitage. I ask that the petition be received and referred to the Department to which it relates.

MR. MacDONNELL:—I ask leave to present a petition from the people of Stephenville in connection with the development of agricultural land as this depends upon the deepening of the river connecting Stephenville Pond and the waters nearby they ask that the river be deepened. At the present time the water is overflowing the banks of the river. I wired them to know the amount of money they would require and they repled saying that the sum of one hundred and fifty dollars would be sufficient. The petition is signed by Father Adams and all the persons in the vicinity. I think the request is reasonable and hope it will be given the careful attention of the Minister of Public Works and I ask that it be referred to his department.

I have another petition from the residents of Port-au-Port, Fox Island River, Stephenville and Aquathuna. I have on more than one occasion voiced the prayer of this petition, namely, the improvements of roads in my district. The petition is signed by everybody in those places and roughly the number of names would be about two hundred and fifty. (Reads petition). This place is twelve miles distant and is cut off from any communication with any other part of the country. We have petitioned time after time for a grant to build a road down there and the people are prepared to go half way if they are given any assistance. This place is the contre of the lobster and cod fishery in the summer time and important in the winter as being the chief centre of the smelt industry. It requires to be connected with the other point by a road and a series of bridges. The whole thing would cost about twenty-five hundred dollars. (Reads petition). As I have already pointed out there is not a single mile of branch railway and this road would connect all the adjoining settlements. We have paid for some of the branch railways and the least you may do is to build a decent main line road to connect up all the other places of the district. This is a reasonable request. The Prime Minister admitted the other day that a special grant was necessary for the roads in St. George's and said further that the per capita grant was in sufficient for that district. Only a small appropriation will be necessary and I think the Government ought to grant the fulfilment of this reasonable request.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to lay on the table a copy of the Auditor General's Report for the year ended June, 1919.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the rules of the House with respect to

present business and all other business to come before the House be suspended. There is very little other business to come before the House. I may say there will be no effort to curtail debate in any matters coming before the House.

MR. HIGGINS asked the Hon. the Prime Minister: (a) Why David Courtenay, later inspector of meats, was dismissed. (b) To lay on the Table of the House copies of any correspondence respecting his dismissal.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—There was absolutely no official correspondence leading up to the dismissal of Mr. Courtenay. Subsequent to his dismissal there was some correspondence, and in particular one or two personal letters from Mr. Courtney, but his dismissal was not based upon any correspondence, official or otherwise, with the Department of Public Health or any other Department.

MR. HIGGINS:—Then what was the reason for his dismissal.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—The work of Meat Inspector formerly came within the duties of Inspector O'Brien. For some years past he has been failing in health, with the result that Mr. Courtney was asked to undertake that portion of Inspector O'Brien's work. As the honourable member for St. John's East knows, Mr. O'Brien was pensioned some time ago, and on the recommendation of the Public Health Officer the next official under him was promoted to the position vacated by Inspector O'Brien. The Government felt that the Inspector would attend to meat inspection as one of his duties.

MR. HIGGINS:—Then it is not the intention of the Government to appoint a new meat inspector.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—There is no immediate intention of appointing a new Meat Inspector. The new inspector will be asked to undertake that work, and if the Inspector and the Public Health Officer feel that the Inspector is over-pressed with work and cannot give the matter sufficient attention, new arrangements will have to be made. The Government views the matter as a balance between efficiency and economy. If the work can be efficiently done by one Inspector and those under him in the Department of Public Health, then there is no necessity of having a specially-paid Meat Inspector. If it is found that it cannot be so done, then such additional help as it may be necessary to employ to have the work properly performed will be employed.

Mr. Bennett asked the Hon. Minister of Posts and Telegraphs who is the newly appointed mail officer on the S.S. "Earl of Devon" on the Cook's Harbor service; when the appointment was made and if other applications from returned soldiers were on file when the appointment was made.

Mr. Bennett asked the Minister of Posts and Telegraps if Miss Chalker, the assistant operator at Brigus has been dismissed and if so why? and to lay on the table of the House statement of any charge that has been laid against her.

Mr. Fox asked the Minister of Public Works to whom the contract for the painting of the Sanitarium has been awarded; what is the contract price, and whether tenders were called for?

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Rules of the House respecting all business now before or to come before it were suspended.

Pursuant to order Hon. the Minister of Education moved the second reading of Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Education Act."

HON. MINISTER OF EDUCATION:—Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this bill I desire, in accordance with the established practice of

this House, to make brief observations upon certain sections of the measure. Before doing so, however, I wish to refer to the criticism that has been directed against the Government regarding the creation of the Department of Education This criticism was particularly strong and insistent during the late bye-election in St. John's West, and was doubtless resorted to, solely, because it was considered good political material, but whether it were so I am not sufficiently skilled in politics to determine. We were told that the creation of a Department of Education with a Ministerial head must surely constitute a serious blow to the existing system. These statements were persistently repeated in the face of equally persistent denials on the part of the Government press that the status-quo of the present denominational system would be disturbed. I desire, therefore, at the outset to allay if possible any doubt or suspicion that may lurk in the minds of honourable members, by stating openly and frankly that the present bill in no way disturbs the existing denominational principles of the system so well known in this colony.

There may be some difference of opinion as to the necessity for a Department of Education, but in view of the fact that we are to-day expending more than $800,000 for educational purposes, the Government has decided that it is advisable to have a minister, who will be responsible to this House for the proper and efficient expenditure of that money. It will be readily admitted, I think, that the question of Education, fundamental and all as it is, has scarcely, if ever, received that measure of attention from this House which its importance for the welfare of the country merits. This omission probably, has not been due to lack of interest on the part of members of this House, but rather to the fact that the system being purely denominational and having no responsible head in the Assembly, members hesitated to criticise the system and its working. The Superintendents were the denominational representatives and immediately the work of any one of them was criticized in this Chamber, ecclesiastical resentment would probably ensue. Now, there will be a responsible minister who will be present to answer for the Department, and be a fair mark for any reasonable criticism. Criticism, especially constructive criticism, is not only desirable but essential; and the fact that criticism of our system and its working is becoming more frequent is an indication of a deeper educational interest and a desire for better things.

The strongest exponents of our present system will, I think, be the first to admit that it has serious defects, and will promptly welcome any measure calculated to minimise or remove them, and so render it possible for the system to yield its best. Wherever we turn to-day, in the civilized world, educationists are at work remodelling their systems, readjusting the courses of study, demanding better qualifications on the part of teachers; and governments are freely expending larger and larger sums of money to render their educational institutions more and more efficient. Never before has education been valued and sought after as it is to-day. The very tension of war has aroused the nations to consider a thorough-going augmentation of elementary education as indispensable to national welfare. It is more forcibly urged to-day than ever before, that the whole future of any people and of their position in the world depends upon the

wisdom of the arrangements that they make for education. People are critically considering their schools and what is taught in them. They have been finding out what schools should mean and at the same time they have been finding out what they have not meant in the past, what they should mean, and must mean in the future. emergencies and demands of war have laid bare certain weaknesses and shortcomings in the scope and character of public education that now call for readjustment and reorganization. The school exists for general benefit and public safety. It is the agency created by government to unify people, conserve ideals, mould and integrate public opinion, and increase the physical wellbeing of rising generations, shape the instinctive desires and attitudes of the young to social ends, and incite each child to vigorous and noble aspirations.

This Dominion, Sir, cannot afford to accept lower educational ideals than our Canadian and American neighbours. Education that is fundamentally essential for them is equally necessary and important for us. Newfoundland in her own interests, must fall in line, must exert such influence as will ultimately render her educational system as efficient as possible, consistent with her financial resources. To demand less, to be satisfied with a lower standard, is to hinder development, arrest progress. and deny to our children that which by every principle of justice and right we are bound to supply them.

One of the chief aims of the present bill is to render it possible to secure better and more adequate returns from our system than it has hitherto yielded. The bill, however, does not meet all the defects, far from it; but given the machinery, we shall be able to cope with them as circumstances permit. The defects of our system, as I see it, are legion, but one of the greatest is the practice that obtains of admitting to the teaching profession persons, in many cases, with a minimum of intellectual preparation and no professional qualifications. This, Mr. Speaker, is no reflection upon the young people who take up this work, frequently with enthusiasm and devotion, but realizing their inability to cope with the task of training the future citizens than which there is no more honourable and dignified, yet no more difficult and exacting work, they either abandon the work altogether, or, as is sometimes the case, descend to merelifeless routine that stunts the mental and moral growth of their pupils. The young teachers themselves deplore this lack of training and frequently express themselves in the strongest terms of condemnation of a system that equips them so badly. The whole country is to-day convinced of the inadequacy of the professional training afforded our teachers, and also of the consequent cruel injustice done the children. Unfortunately the opinion prevails in many parts of this country that any person at all can teach a school, any person can train the mind and fashion the character of children and worse still, Sir, this opinion eventuates in practice. I tell this House, sir, and through it the country, that a more mischievous idea and a more pernicious practice rarely obtained a footing in any land. We insist that the lawyer shall receive proper professional training—be fitted to discharge his duty to his clients, that the physician shall give evidence of professional knowledge and skill which enable him to diagnose and cope with the ills of the human body; but those who are called upon to inspire our children with lofty ideals, to develop mental growth, and to lay the foundation of true character and

citizenship we accept, in many cases, without any evidence of their fitness for the work. To send these young people out with such equipment is unjust and unfair to them and to expect the best returns is as unwise as to seek water in an empty well. The educational waste resulting from the employment of inefficient, unprofessionally trained teachers is being brought home to even the most indifferent. The precious years of childhood are being wasted—since many of our children emerge from the schools almost mentally hopeless. Not only is a large proportion of the pupils' time frittered away but habits inimical to the pupils' future civic welfare are formed. Too often, the time is spent in teaching text-books rather than children, in preparing for examination rather than life. The aim, in some cases, appears to be information, facts, rules, rather than inspiration, character and growth.

Every other civilized country has its Normal School devoted entirely to the professional training of their teachers. In each of the neighbouring Provinces of Canada one or more such schools are found. In the United States to-day, the tendency is to demand four years of High School work as a prerequisite for admission to the Normal School, then two years of professional work mainly, in such an institution. The object is to make the students thoroughly familiar with the subject matter which they will be required to teach and also acquaint them with the most efficient methods of presenting the material and of handling the manifold problems of a school. That is to say, additional Academic Study is allowed but special attention is devoted to professional training and supervised practice. Switzerland, that little country of unsurpassed natural scenery, demands four years of attendance at Teachers' Seminaries where both Academic and professional work are taken before the Elementary teachers' certificate is granted. Those who subsequently desire to engage in Secondary School work can only do so by attending a university or some other higher institution of learning for two or more semesters, and submitting to a rigid examination by a Board of Examiners comprised of specialists. In Sweden, three years of training are required before one may enter the teaching profession, while in Norway the persistent problem is whether the training period should be extended from three to four years. I mention these facts, sir, merely to show what other countries are doing in the way of professionally training their teachers. In Newfoundland we have no Normal School, and teachers receive practically no professional training and certificates are too often given as a mere matter of form on the results of the Examinations of the Council of Higher Education.

One of the provisions of this bill is the erection, equipment, and maintenance of a Normal School so that teachers in the future will get some professional training before entering upon the work of conducting schools. Until this school is established it is unreasonable to expect returns commensurate with our educational expenditure. When the Normal School is ready we propose to select students with care and discretion, provide them with more liberal financial assistance tory of this colony, and afford them course of study under the guidance of the opportunity of pursuing a suitable than at any other time within the hisexpert teachers. At the present time Superintendents find a difficulty in securing prospective teachers. We propose now to have circular letters sent out, not alone to Chairmen of Boards, but to principals of schools, pointing

out the provision made by the Government for the purpose of inducing suitable persons to enter upon the work of training for the teaching profession. Under the old Act, males in training were entitled to receive a sum not to exceed One Hundred dollars per year; females eighty dollars. The present bill makes the amount One Hundred and Eighty for males and One Hundred and Sixty for females. During the training period students will be afforded demonstration and practice under properly qualified critic teachers, so that when they leave the institution to engage in what we trust may prove for many of them, at least, their life's work, we may reasonably look for results.

We do not propose even then to drop these young people. We are making provision under this bill to render them skilful and sympathetic assistance so that they may avoid the pitfalls into which too many of their predecessors have fallen. We are confronted with a dual problem—to train not only the future teachers as they enter the Normal School, but to change the major portion of our untrained teachers into a band of men and women, alive to modern educational problems; supply a new conception of popular education, and a new spirit in the teaching corps. In the attempt to accomplish this the efforts of the teachers themselves will not be lacking. We propose to key up our teachers by sending out a number of capable, sympathetic, experienced teachers as Supervising Inspectors who will have had special training for the work. They will visit not as mere inspectors, judges, spies or detectives to discover failings only; but to render service, to assist teachers in finding solutions to their special school problems. We need more than mere criticism, which is cheap, disheartening and destructive in its influence. The Supervisors will be enthuiastic educationists, tolerant, patient and experienced; persons who will know how to assist the teachers to master principles and so attain freedom in their chosen profession. They will remain in a school long enough, at a visit, to determine definitely the strong and weak points of discipline, instruction, and method; detect cram, inefficiency or monotonous routine, if such exist, and give the teacher sufficient time in conference to discuss, in a friendly spirit, the weak points, arrange for their eradication and hence in this way materially increase the efficiency of the teacher and generally stimulate all to greater effort. We have lost much in the past because of the lack of skilled supervision. The teachers have been expected to do that which we have not fitted them to do. We have been unreasonably expecting returns, but instead, Sir, we have been confronted with a certain indifference, and insular—medieval educational ideas. We have been striving to show results by submitting poorly taught pupils to written, competitive examinations, thus affording our people an incorrect standard of judgment. The living agent—the supervisor—will now replace in a large measure the written examination.

It may be urged that we are unduly increasing the number of these Supervisors in this country—that the expenditure is not justified. As a matter of fact, experience has abundantly proved that moneys expended for the salaries of such Supervisors in other countries produce far greater returns in increased educational efficiency than similar sums expended for classroom teaching. To attain excellence in teaching requires long experience ander wise and prudent guidance. Nothing is more vital to the school than the constant improvement of the teachers in the field. To secure this improvement is one purpose of the Supervising Inspectors. Wherever

they have been enrolled to work under right conditions, no other single factor has contributed so largely to the excellent results attained.

The present bill provides, too, for an Advisory Board whose powers and duties are clearly defined. There may be difference of opinion as to the necessity of such a Board but to me it appears to be indispensable. No honourable member, Sir, I am sure desires to see Education dragged into the hurley-burley of party politics. It is not inconceivable that disputes may arise between Superintendents and teachers, and when such do occur, here we have a court of appeal. The Minister should not, in my opinion, be expected to decide those questions—these disputes, lest the dissatisfied party should accuse him of being swayed by political consideration. The constitution of the Advisory Board prevents the possibility of such a contingency arising, at least as far as the Minister is concerned.

With regard to the matter of educational finance—the Government this year has made a substantial increase in the Augmentation Grant; we have in fact made the largest contribution, the most substantial increase to the augmentation grant ever made in this colony—an increase of $64,675 has been made this year which will bring the total vote for that purpose up to $226,362.

MR. MacDONNELL:—Is that exclusive of the 20% increase given last year?

MINISTER OF EDUCATION:—Yes, the total grant for Augmentation to the end of June this year is $161,687 and to that sum we now add $64,675. We are giving an additional $10,000 to help defray expenses of students attending the Normal School; and $10,000 additional for the erection, equipping, and renovating of school buildings. There are a few old teachers in the colony who were never contributors to the Pension Fund, and consequently cannot participate in its benefits. Only a short time ago I met a very accomplished lady-teacher, of many years standing, who because of straitened circumstance has been forced to spend the evening of life in the Poor Asylum. We are taking an extra vote, now, to meet these few outstanding cases and afford them a small retiring allowance.

This bill, too, makes provision for the establishment of Night Schools and a vote of $10,000 is made for the purpose. We have heard much during the last ten or fifteen years about Night Schools for the purpose of affording some of our young men and women the opportunity of learning to read and write—an opportunity that has in the past been denied them, or if present they for some reason have failed to take advantage of. The Government is making an effort in this way to help in some measure to reduce the high percentage of illiteracy in this country and I bespeak for the movement the unanimous support of this House as well as the press of the country. In looking over the census returns for 1911, I find that after eliminating all persons below ten years of age we still have 17% of the total population listed as illiterate. The step above illiteracy in America is shown by the ability to read the newspaper and write a letter to a friend. If such a test could be applied to our people it would show our percentage of illiteracy to be very much in excess of the figure just stated.

I shall refer very briefly, Sir, to just one more feature of the present bill—namely the provision to foster School Libraries. Apart from the Colleges and a few Superior Schools, our schools lack libraries. One of the functions of the school is doubtless to teach reading—to put the child in

possession of the key to hidden treasures of knowledge, but it is also in duty bound to engender a love for reading by whetting the pupils' appetites for the best things in the language. We have, it seems to me, failed in this respect and in consequence many of those who reach perhaps the third or fourth standards leave school, not only without having acquired the taste for good literature, but with a strong dislike for books; and as a result they not only fail to read anything but forget what they have learnt and slowly but surely help to swell the ranks of illiteracy. With better trained teachers, and good literature available, we hope to cure this disease-spot in our system.

Mr. Speaker, I fear I have trespassed too long upon the indulgence of this House, but the importance of the subject, Sir, must be my apology. No other subject of such vital importance, it seems to me, can occupy the attention of members of this House; and in no better way can representatives discharge their obligations to their constituencies than by intelligent advocacy of education. We owe it also to our gallant sailors and soldiers to see to it that in our system, in our schools, their achievements, their victories be made to stimulate our boys and girls to go forth not alone to such victories but to unrecorded triumphs, unwritten conquests. Let us, therefore, betake ourselves seriously to the consideration of this measure, and in deliberation devoid of party strife, endeavour to rid it of its imperfections. Let our single aim in this important matter at least be the best within our means for the children, the future citizens and bulwarks of our beloved country. Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the second reading of the bill.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the Bill entitled "An Act to amend and Consolidate the Laws in relation to the Municipal Affairs of the Town of St." was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the Bill entitled "An Act further to amend the Revenue Act, 1905," was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs gave notice that he would on to-morrow move the House into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting a Loan for Railway improvement and Coal Development.

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

The House then adjourned accordingly.

THURSDAY, July 8th, 1920.

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

Hon. the Minister of Justice gave notice that he would on to-morrow ask leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the collection and distribution of the Estates of certain Esquimaux deceased.

Mr. Bennett gave notice of question.

MR. MacDONNELL:—Mr. Speaker, I want to present some petitions from the people of St. George's on the subject of that contemplated road. I have already spoken of this matter. I have reason to believe that before long a concrete proposition will be put before this House on this matter. The petitions, though somewhat differently worded, are unanimous in expressing the wish of the people. Something ought to be done towards the development of the West Coast. We have

been told by the Prime Minister that it ought be done but we can't get it done. If it is not done by the Government it will be done by some outside parties. I have every reason to believe that if any reasonable proposition is put before the Government that the Government will not turn it down. The people of the West Coast have a lot to be safeguarded. I would ask that these petitions be referred to the Department of Public Works, and that the Minister see that the matter is put before the Executive Government.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Justice the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to amend and Consolidate the Laws in relation to the Municipal Affairs of the Town of St. John's.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—Mr. Speaker, I was spoken to about this matter of the Municipal Charter. I told them that we were following the wish of the Citizens' Committee. I would like to say for the information of the honourable member that the bill is practically a result of the suggestions of the Citizens' Committee.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Mr. Speaker, I might say that I am entirely indifferent as to whether the bill is passed or not. There is an effort to close the House as soon as possible, and it is up to the Citizens' Committee to see that it is put in shape.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—Mr. Speaker, I have received a communication from the Secretary of the Citizens' Committee. The position of the Government now is that the Commission goes out of office the 31st December, and unless the bill is passed another Commission will have to be appointed,

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE & FISHERIES:—I suggest that we proceed with the bill, and if it is necessary to bring in an amendment next year let it come in when there is lots of time to discuss it.

MR. BENNETT:—Mr. Speaker, I feel somewhat in the same frame of mind on this matter as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The objections of the Citizens' Committee have been met, and the bill is the result. There is no reason why the whole thing should be held up, unless they have for some reason changed their minds.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, the bill is a lengthy one, and may or may not cause some discussion. I would suggest that we go through the committee stage, and let the preamble stand over. I gather that the recommendations of the Committee are practically within the scope of the bill. I suggest that we go through the committee stage, then let the committee rise and report progress, so as to give the Citizens' Committee a chance to meet to-night, and be in the committee stage. This would give the advantage of having the bill disposed of so far as this House is concerned, subject only to such recommendations as the Citizens' Committee may have to make with respect thereto. If as a result of to-night's meeting the Citizens' Committee desire to offer any suggestions, these suggestions would then be considered when the bill is in committee stage to-morrow, but it would then be necessary to consider only such matters as have been brought to the attention of the House by the Citizens' Committee. I feel that this bill should not be finalized to-day. The Citizens' Committee have had the same opportunity of perusing the Bill as I have had and all the other members of the House have had except those who formed the special informal committee which went into the

whole matter carefully and are responsible for the Bill in its present form, but that merely means that the Bill has been in their hands for a day or two and naturally, being busy with other than Legislative matters, they have not had an opportunity of perusing it carefully. I am informed that the Committee is holding a meeting this evening and feel that we should not finalize this Bill in its Committee Stage this afternoon. It is a courtesy which we owe to the Citizens' Committee, many members of which have given months' time in a careful consideration of city problems and city legislation.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Speaker, I agree with suggestions.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had made some progress and asked leave to sit again on to-morrow.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Education the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Education Act" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Education Act."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of Committee.

MR. MacDONNELL:—It has been said that it is desirable to keep education out of politics; well, you can't do it because the minister is a politician. You can't keep education out of politics and it is a mistake to drag it into it. That the present system hasn't been going well in the country may be right but it will never go right while it is connected with politics. If a teacher finds that he has not been treated right by the government he is sure to blame the doctor. I would like to ask the doctor one question and that is if it is his intention to abolish the Council of Higher Education under this system. I find here in section 24 that the salary for the superintendent is $3,332 and the assst. superintendent $2,650 and district superintendents $1,600, and the point I want to make is that Mr. Wilson, a very conscientious worker and a universal favourite, will under the present system be receiving a salary less than the asst. superintendent. I will oppose that section if nobody else does. When it comes to a question of being given a show no man is more deserving of it than Mr. Wilson and I would ask the doctor to consider this. I would also ask him if last year's grant for the Council of Higher Education is still going on. In reference to the vote for expenses, the ordinary official, policeman, customs official or any other man in the public service from the premier down gets his expenses paid as per the account sent in by him. Why the Educational Department should be limited to a certain amount I do not know. I have had the experience of travelling at times where I had to spend a month's salary on a two week trip. These men should be paid to the cent for all expenses that they incur in connection with that department. If you don't do that you know what is going to happen when their grant is all spent —they will discontinue their work. We should encourage the superintendents to visit the schools as often as possible and do not handicap the. They should not have to spend their salaries for

travelling expenses. Now in reference to the minister himself I don't see what he has to do. He has to collect reports and he is here to answer questions, but I think that it is a pity that a Bill should be brought in here which doesn't give Dr. Barnes the chance to let Newfoundland know what he is doing for Education. One section here provides for delivering addresses for the stimulation of educational efforts in this country. Surely it is not the intention to relegate the minister to that.

HON. MINISTER OF EDUCATION:—That work will be assigned to the superintendents.

MR. MacDONNELL:—I also notice here that there will be an annual census of children from 6 to 14 years of age and that all children between these ages must attend school, it is not sufficient that we should vote a sum of money to that. I would like to know if the Governor in Council has anything to do with fees. I would also like to know if the Doctor has power to requisition for any grant.

HON. MINISTER OF EDUCATION:—No, I can't requisition for money.

MR. MacDONNELL:—I hope that before we come to the reading the Doctor will clear up two matters I have referred to, that is the Council of Education and the Advisory Board and who comprised of. Whether the minister can select his staff and who the deputy minister will be.

HON. MINISTER OF EDUCATION:—I sincerely thank the hon. member for the district of St. George's for the helpful criticism he has advanced in reference to the Bill now before the Chair. It is very evident from the remarks of the hon. gentleman that he has been a member of the teaching profession and I have been expecting something from him in this connection and I must say that I have not been disappointed. I would like to refer very briefly to the few remarks and I hope that my answers will be satisfactory. The first point that has been discussed by the hon. member is the defects in the present system. That there are defects must be readily admitted. A system of education must be a progressive one because education itself is a progressive science and a system which does not progress with the times is worn out. In the educational world to-day the greatest and brightest minds are tending to remedy the system at present in use because they have realized that that system must grow old. Our system has grown old. It has not been given a thorough overhauling and I don't claim that this Bill will give it a thorough overhauling. But, it has not had a thorough overhauling since its inauguration in 1874. Our system has gone on so long without affording professional training to teachers and it is of fundamental importance that this be done. I am glad that the hon. gentleman has expressed his approval on that point. In reference to the other defects it would do no good to specify them. The hon. gentleman has said that we have established the only thing worth while in this Bill when we provided the means of giving professional training to teachers, but if we give a teacher that professional training and send him into some remote part of the colony would it be not also worth while to have a superintendent travelling around and getting in touch with that teaher so that he may be able to put his hand on the weak spots which time and again find their way into the system that is now in vogue in the outports. We are going to appoint a number of qualified inspectors who will be thoroughly competent for the work and who will spend a certain time in each school and discover the defects, if any, and apply the remedy for them. You will pardon me if I

must take up the time of the House in relating an experience of my own which bears out my contentions. A young lady was sent to a smal school in an outport two or three years ago and when I went there to visit her and see her at work I noticed she had fallen back and was using methods that find no place today from a scientific standpoint. Speaking afterwards in tears she told me that without anybody to counsel her she had fallen back. A few years ago superintendents visited certain sections of the country and as proof of the benefits obtained the Superintendent of the Church of England Schools was in receipt of many letters testifying to the great benefit and expressing the wish that some day a corps of such superintendents would be sent throughout the country. For this this reason and many others I do claim that these appointments are one of the big things in this Bill.

I have referred to Switzerland by way of comparison, but I have not mentioned Norway or the United States. I think the improvements made by the Swiss are a result of their system of education. I visited their schools there, and in one of them found being taught English. I spent one morning in this particular school. At that time news arrived of the sinking of the Titanic and I asked them if they would like to hear the story about her. They assented, and I told it. Afterwards I asked if they would like to ask any questions. They hesitated, but after a while one young fellow stood up and asked me the following question: "What are your resources in Newfoundland?" and another question asked was: "How far have you succeeded in adapting science to your resources?" This shows that their their system is second to none in the civilized world, and we may take a tip from them in this respect. The hon. gentleman asked what is being done to encourage young men to remain in the profession. I thank him for that question. I have been supplied with certain data in connection with this, part of which I will read to you just to show how far that point touches on the educational system in this country. Out of 739 teachers, 253 have remained in the profession from 5 to 10 years, 80 from 11 to 15 years, 30 from 16 to 20 years, 32 from 21 to 25 years, 27 from 26 to 30 years, 21 from 31 to 35 years and 15 from 36 to 40 years. This shows a gradual decline in teachers from 5 years down. From the year 1909 to the year 1919, 468 C. of E. teachers dropped out of the profession, and 640 Roman Catholics, making a total of 1108 teachers for ten years. In 1920 183 teachers dropped out of the profession; 52 C. of E., 64 R. C., and 67 Methodists. A total of 56 schools have been closed for want of teachers. Another big handicap which shows the inadequacy of our system is the fact that we have teaching in this country to-day ungraded teachers What are we going to do to meet this question? During the life of the past governments teachers were not allowed enough to come into St. John's to get through their grades. The present Government has increased that grant which offers an inducement to young people to come forward and do their very best.

I think a circular should be sent to the teachers in charge of schools, and when the results of the Council of Higher Education are made known a circular letter will be sent to those who are in the Intermediate Grade, pointing out the advantages of this section, namely, the increase in the grant to enable teachers to secure

the training which we all know is necessary. That is not all. I think I observed yesterday, the total increases we have made in the Education Grant is one hundred and thirty thousand dollars. Of that, not less than one hundred and one thousand six hundred and sixty-five dollars finds its way to the pockets of the teachers, and in this way: We have the extra ten thousand dollars to encourage pupil teachers, six thousand six hundred and seventy-five dollars for augmentation, ten thousand dollars for night schools, sixteen thousand dollars for salaries of those ten teachers chosen for inspectors, ten thousand dollars to help old teachers who have dropped out of harness, and for whom up to the present time no provision has been made. I am quite aware that our teachers are worth more than that. Having spent thirty-five years in the profession myself, I think I know what work our teachers are doing and what they are worth, and I want to say to this House, this evening, and to this country, through the Reporters' box, that as long as I am in charge of the Department of Education, the needs of the teachers will be advocated; but we cannot do all that is necessary in one year. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but the Government has decided that we shall obtain from the teachers in convention, certain views which they hold respecting this matter of salary, and we have determined that a Committee will be appointed to go into the whole question of salaries for teachers, with a view to securing a minimum salary, beyond which it will be illegal to engage a teacher. .The next question that my honorable friend asked me was, who selects the staff for this normal school. The Governor-in-Council appoints the Principal of the normal school, and he will be free to select his own staff. Another question the honorable gentleman asked about the Supervisors, how are they selected? If he will refer to Section 21, Sub-section 1 of the Bill, he will find that it deals with this matter. I will read it for you.

In answer to the question, I would say that we are leaving it to heads of the Denominations to appoint Supervisors. The Superintendent of each denomination will be requested to furnish with three of each denomination, who will have certain qualifications laid down under the Act. Now about this Advisory Board, I still adhere to my opinion that the Advisory Board is necessary. I may say that some time ago in Ontario where they had an Advisory Board they discontinued it, because the Department felt that it could get all the necessary information from the Superintendent and the District Supervisors and officials of the Department itself. But it has been since learned that the advice received in that way was not as sound as the advice that would be given by an Advisory Board. It was colored by the personality of each person who gave it. It lacked cohesion, because each person gave his advice from his own standpoint, and it has been contended by one of the principal educationalists in that Province that it has lost by abolishing that Advisory Board. The necessity for it here, however, seems to me to keep party politics out of the Department. It is true that politics will enter, must enter, but party politics need not enter. I hope that as long as I hold that office that nobody will be able to accuse me of dragging party politics into it. I have refrained from taking any part in elections since my appointment to that office, for the reason that my my first duty is to Education, and not to the party of which

I am a part. It is conceivable, I am sure, that cases may arise when it will be necessary for two parties to be heard, and the best court of appeal in my opinion is the Advisory Board, not the Minister of Education, and I may say that the Minister of Education is not a member of that Board, as the function of that Board is to advise the Minister of Education, and it is for him to act upon the decision of that Board.

MR. MacDONNELL:—Will the Minister have anyhting to say in the selection of the five men on that Board?

MR. BARNES:—No, they are to be chosen by the heads of the denominations alone. Even the Teachers' Association has a right to select three teachers provided they belong to the three leading denominations. It is not the intention of this Bill to interfere with denominational status as it is to-day. Take for instance, the Supervisors, they are appointed in the same way by the Governor-in-Council, but nominated by the heads of the denominations, and it will bel the same with this.

Now in connection with the Council of Higher Education, there is a great difference of opinion as to the work being done by them. There was a time, in my opinion, when it was absolultely necessary, but I am not so sure that it has not now outlived its usefulness. Of course that is only my opinion, and I am not trying to force it. I think one reason for this is that we are today submitting our children to competitive examination and a school is judged by the results it produces in that examination, and that means we are asking our people to judge by a false standard. It is quite possible for the teachers to get children through these examinations dishonestly, although I do not say that it is done. I have had considerable experience. No less than one hundred of girls and boys taking Associate Grade have gone through my hands, and from what I saw of the work submitted to me, I say that it it no credit to the work done by the C.H.E. I am not sure that the C.H.E. should not be replaced by another body that would do better work. Your only test of efficiency to-day is the result of the C.H.E. examinations. I have visited schools where I have found one teacher in charge of seventy or eighty pupils, and that teacher was trying to pass one pupil through Primary or Preliminary Grade, and consequently the other children submitted to his care were neglected. An old teacher of my acquaintance said to me some time ago—I will use his own words: "I want to tell you that under present conditions I am forced to prepare candidates for the C.H.E. examinations, and what I do is to try and pass some pupils and neglect the rest." However, I have only been in office a short time and I am sure my honorable friend will allow that it has been impossible to deal with the number of things that I hope will be dealt with in a satisfactory manner eventually.

With regard to the Registrar of that Institution and the increase in salary, there has been a misunderstanding there. There has been very little increase, if any. Superintendents' salaries have had no increase. The gentlemen opposite have asked the members of the Government on what basis the increases in the Estimates have been made, and I am happy to be able to answer for myself that the Superintendents' salaries have as a basis the salary paid to the Superintendent of the R. C. denomination resident in this city. His salary last year is the standard to which the others have been raised. I am not so sure that it would be advisable for me to state just how that

was brought about, but if the honorable gentleman would like to se the figures I will be only too glad to put them at his disposal. With regard to the Assistant Superintendents there is very little increase in their salaries. These men have done yeomen service. If either of these gentlemen were to become incapacitated and retire, his retiring allowance would be smaller than that given to an ordinary clerk in a Government office, and I am sure that no honorable gentleman will contend that that is right. The Superintendent's salary voted was $1600.00. He got, in addition to that, the amount paid by other denominations. The Augmentation Grant was used in order to help these two gentlemen to live. There was a demand on the Augmentation to enable them live. The Augmentation Grant, according to the Act, is to be paid to a teacher who has a certificate stating that he has successfully conducted a school for one year. These men had been doing the work of teachers, but they were not teachers in the real sense of the term. Now we have saved that money for teachers' augmentation and given these men a regular salary. The salaries will be voted them in the Estimates the same as Government officials. With respect to the travelling expenses of the Superintendents and Assistant Superintendents, the work of office has increased manifold in the past ten years. To-day his presence is required constantly in his office, so that the necessity of voting a larger sum than two hundred dollars for travelling expenses is not apparent. In Nova Scotia the amount paid him for travelling expenses is two hundred dollars, and we are paying the same amount. I may say for the information of Mr. MacDonnell that it was the intention to divide the country into sections and put one Superintending Inspector in each area or district. That would lessen the distance he would have to travel, and he would be able to do better work. but for some reason that plan was abandone. This is a start. however. It may be necessary later to fall in with the views of my honorable friend, and when it is necessary I will be one of the first to support him in these views.

With regard to school census, census of children between the ages of six and fourteen, we have very few statistics. Next year is census year and we hope to have a full report of the ages of children, so that we shall have an idea of how many children of a certain age are at school and how many have not been to school.

MR MacDONNELL:—Just one word to thank Dr. Barnes for the information he has given. I may agree with him that something should be done with regard to the C.H.E., a change in the Examiners perhaps, but we must have some system of examination or test. The publishing of results may be wrong, and competitive examination for young children may not be sound, but we must have some system. However, as we are not abolishing the C.H.E. I think that a decent salary should be paid the Registrar; a salary equivalent to that of a Superintendent, and that the Secretary in that Department should get as much as the Secretary in the Marine and Fisheries Department. I would ask the Minister to look into that matter and see if it cannot be adjusted immediately. The Registrar of the Council of Higher Education is doing good work and should get as much salary as a Superintendent, and the Secretary should get a salary of twenty-seven hundred dollars, the same as a Secretary in any of the Government Departments. With regard to Pensions for teachers, I hope

as Mr. Barnes has said, that something will be done in that connection. A teacher in the past has had no show in this mater. He must give thirty or forty years service before he gets a pension at all. Does it not suggest itself to the Minister that this falling off in teachers is not in a great measure attributable to the fact that teachers after they spent five years in the profession get out of it? The Doctor has not told us when the normal school is going to be established. I suppose he will later on. I trust that the Doctor will attend to that request of mine in relation to the matter of Higher Education, and I hope he will see that there will be no discrimination in regard to salary.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to say aynthing regarding the Bill itself, as, apparentl, the House is unanimous in adopting the principle of this Bill. I might say that it is the first time in the history of the country that we have had a Minister of Education, and I feel, speaking for this side of the House, that however much we may regard the programme as falling short of what was expected as regards the Bill, and however much we may be inclined to think that the Bill may not make any marked improvements of present conditions, we will all agree in one respect, and that is that the selection of the first new Minister is a gentleman who, we are all satisfied, will do his best to carry out the educational programme for the betterment of our common country; and we feel, further, that the Government in their selection, so far as this House possesses knowledge, have a fitting gentleman for that post. Dr. Barnes is a man of undoubted sinlerity and we wish his educational programme here and his department all the proud hopes tha the holds for them, and trust that his hopes will be fully realized; and we do say, however much we have in the past, as regards the Estimates, more or less criticized the idea of creating a department at all, that we are in no way at variance with the position, but rather have we the utmost confidence as to his own personal fitness for occupying the position he is now in; and we have the undoubted assurance that he will conduct that department in the spirit in which he has spoken to-day, a spirit not alone of fairness and propriety as regards the people, but more than all, with the keen desire of one who wants better educational conditions and facilities in this country. I trust that the department will be responsible for advancing things educationally in the direction about which we have had much adverse comment of late years.

The Minister himself and the member for St. George's reminded me this afternoon of a point that I would like to mention. Being in the unfortunate position of being consulted at meal hours as regards examination papers, naturally one's attention is drawn to them. I have seen some papers this year and I might say that the class of papers for young boys were very inapt. I have seen the type of paper referred to by the Hon. member for St. George's, and really it would be better if it was out of the syllabus altogether. I think we want a change of syllabus and a more judicious selection of gentlemen to set the examination papers. Personally I do not know who has been setting them. I am in favor of the principle of competitive examinations because I think that, generally speaking, it is a fair test, but certainly I think that the quality and class of test at present in existence is wrong. I am not an educationalist, but speaking in the sense of a layman, I hope that the

Minister himself when he gets down to work will see the wisdom of adopting a different method. I do not think that there should be a total condemnation of the C.H.E. system as I see it. It has done a lot of good work. If the C.H.E. is not continued I hope that something similar will, As regards competitive examinations, I desire to repeat my personal good wishes and respects to the occupant of the new position and I congratulate him on behalf of the Opposition for the manner in which he introduced our first educational budget, and I hope that in years to come that the Minister and his Department will make such improvements that there will be no disagreement at all to this Act. I wish Mr. Barnes to understand clearly that the comment made in the past in no way reflected on his honesty of purpose or against the Department over which he is now going to preside.

MR. WALSH:—I cannot let this opportunity pass without expressing my appreciation of the Minister's success in bringing down this important measure. I can assure him that I am glad he has been so far successful and he has my hearty support in his great national work. I am sure the management of the Education Department will reflect credit not alone upon himself and his assistants but also reflect credit upon the country. St. John's perhaps to a greater extent than any other cestion of the country is given facilities in the way of education. But I am particularly interested in the outport school and whatever little schooling I got I obtained it in the District of Twillingate. I am interested in the outport school, not alone in my district, but in other sections of the country that I know so well to have suffered so badly from the lack of education, and this particular scheme that the Minister is ushering in will, I hope, remedy this condition of affairs and I hope the staff associated with the Minister will be of the same calibre as the genial Minister, and this being so, I see a bright future ahead for education in Newfoundland. I hope that in the interests of the whole population the matter will be grappled with in detail and with success. Take up the public press and you will read how abroad it is so currently reported that the people of Newfoundland are illiterate and very backward. Now this is an unfortunate state of affairs. Of course the people engaged in the fisheries cannot get a university training, yet they ought to be given a decent education which at present they are deprived of. I could not let this opportunity pass without expressing my confidence in the Minister and particularly hoping that he will meet with success.

MR. SAMSON:—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks before this Bill passes through the Committee stage. I contend that this is one of the most important Bills that has come before the House. Education is undoubtedly the most important topic of this country, because upon it depends the future development of our Dominion, and the future intelligence of our people. Education has never received in this country the attention due to it.

In the past we have had yearly reports handed out by the various Superintendents of Education and we have found that these reports have contained many grievances and requests for reform. Some people have been interested enough to read these reports and forget them immediately after, but invariably they were never perused by the majority of our people.

I believe the Government is fully

justified in creating a new department to deal with this most important subject. Now that we have a Departmental Head, our grievances, our requests and our criticisms can be aired in this House and the necessary reforms made from time to time.

I contend that the present system of education is very deficient in many ways. One of the great causes of these defects is due to the fact that our teachers have never been trained.

Mr. MacDonnell and I had the misfortune to be thrust upon an innocent public, as teachers, at the age of seventeen. Personally, I knew as much then about a child and his developments as I did about something I had never seen or heard of. I treated a child as a machine and tried to obtain results in my own crude way. When I think of the pupils I first taught, I can sincerely pity them.

Just think of the idea of sending a person after three months' training, or very often no training at all, to do the most important work in the country. In what other trade or profession would one become a director or master after such a training?

The teacher in his professional capacity is responsible for the development, of the body, the mind, and to a large extent, the soul of the child. How can he accomplish satisfactorily such a tremendous task if he has received but three months' professional training? No wonder our people are illeterate, no wonder we are 100 years behind the times.

The establishing and conducting of a Normal School in our midst, even if we have nothing else to our credit, will be a monument of which the so-called "Sausage Government" may justly feel proud.

As regards the inspection of schools, I contend, with all due respect to the gentlemen who conduct the work, that the system has been little more than a farce. It is a case of "the harvest being plentiful, but the laborers few." Under present conditions, the Superintendent or Inspector rushes through the work—he needs must rush because of the limited time at his disposal—and after a few hours, or very often, a few minutes, the work of inspection is done. In such a short time he cannot do justice either to teachers or to pupils, nor can he form any correct opinion as to what the pupils have accomplished during the year.

I seriously contend that the appointment of ten inspectors is a move in the right direction. Ten inspectors may be sufficient if our system were inter-denominational, but with the preent system it requires twenty or thirty to do the work which should be accomplished. These inspectors, by examinations, by criticisms, by pattern lessons and by lectures can be of inestimable benefit to teachers, children and parents.

The appointment of an Advisory Board I am quite in accord with. The increase in Augmentation is a move in the right direction, but the increase is not nearly large enough.

Teachers leave the profession because they are under-paid, and until you can pay them a living wage there will always be an exodus of the best and most efficient.

During my fifteen years of service in the teaching profession my maximum salary was only $760.00. At what other occupation or profession could I engage in and at the end of fifteen years receive such a paltry wage.

Teachers will not stay in the profession until the salaries are double what they are at present.

Night schools and school libraries

are good things and are very important from an educational point of view. The building of schools in isolated places and the renovating and equipping of many of our old schools demand attention.

I give this Bill as far as it goes my hearty support, but I am sorry this Bill is not stronger in its demands for more reforms and higher salaries. I believe that the teachers who will meet here for Convention next week will not be satisfied with this Bill, and I should not be surprised if demands were made for more sweeping reforms than can now be accomplished.

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. the Prime Minister introduced a Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Trustee Investments" which was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time presently.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:— This afternoon the Rt. Hon. Sir William Lloyd, Registrar of the Supreme Court, called upon me in the House, submitting a draft form of a Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Trustee Investments." Sir William Lloyd explained that because of his office of Registrar of the Supreme Court he was trustee of a large number of estates and held about $200,000 worth of Newfoundland Bonds. These bonds were payable to Bearer. Under the Trustee Act it was unlawful for him as trustee to hold bonds payable to bearer and Sir William stated that he had discussed the matter with the Deputy Minister of Justice and the Judges of the Supreme Court, and they had all agreed that this position should be remedied by Statute. There was no provision under the law of the country whereby these Government bonds payable to bearer could be registered so as to be payable only to the registered holder or bearer. This Act, of which I now give notice, is very brief and merely declares that it shall be lawful for the Minister of Finance and Customs to open at the Finance Office a register and that bonds issued by virtue of any Act of the Newfoundland Legislature may upon the application of any trustee be registered in that special Trustee Bond Register at the Finance Office. Since visiting the House this afternoon Sir William Lloyd has discussed the matter with the Attorney General and with the senior lawyer on the Opposition side of the House, Mr. W. J. Higgins, and I understand the Opposition will raise no objection to the immediate introduction of this Bill and its passage through all the stages. I consequently ask leave to introduce this Bill.

Whereupon on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister, the Bill entitled "An Act Relating to Trustee Investments" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon on motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled, "An Act Relating to Trustee Investments."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs 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 Relating to Trustee Investments" 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.

Mr. Speaker left the chair until eight of the clock.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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 Exportation of Salt Codfish" with some amendments in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the said amendments were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time presently.

Whereupon, the amendments were read a second time and passed and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the said amendments had been agreed to without amendment.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Education the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Education Act."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs 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 amendment.

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

Whereupon, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Education Act" 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.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply—

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed certain Resolutions, and asked leave to sit again.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Mr. Fox, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 143 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled ' Of the Keeping of Dogs,' " was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon, the House resolved itself into a Committe of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 143 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Keeping of Dogs.' "

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs tok the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE SPEAKER:—This is a law to shoot the poor man's dog which is his horse in the outports, and not a few times during the bitter winter months he uses his dog to go in the woods and bring home loads of firewood to keep his family warm. But at the same time, while you shoot

this man's dog, you allow hunting dogs to be kept, and I can say from my own experience in Carbonear that there the sheep have been more annoyed by the hunting dog than any other class of dog. Therefore I think this clause ought to be excepted, and if it in my power I will refuse to put this clause before the Chamber.

MR. SULLIVAN:—I note the amendment suggested and have much pleasure in supporting it.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the Bill with some amendment.

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

Whereupon, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 143 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Keeping of Dogs'" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed being entitled as above and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

MR. BENNETT:—I asked the other day, in the absence of the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, two questions. They were on the order paper yesterday. Might I have a reply now from the Minister who is now present?

HON. MIN. POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS:—In connection with the position of Mail Clerk on the Ss. Earl of Devon, I may say that no clerk has been appointed. With regard to Miss Chalker's dismissal. I may say that she got the regular three months' notice and according to that notice she was dismissed and now another lady is doing her work. Apparently the Executive Government deemed it fit to make this change. No serious charge was made against her.

MR. BENNETT:—For what reason then? Is it because of her relatives not being favorable to the Government, or what?

HON. MIN. OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS:—I suppose it is an ordinary thing in the course of a Government, especially a new Government, to make any changes and there has been a change in this connection and they are responsible for it.

The remaining orders of the Day were deferred.

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

Mr. Fox gave notice of Question.

The House then adjourned accordingly,

——O——

FRIDAY, July 9th, 1920.

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

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the people of Branch asking for a breakwater. It is hardly necessary for me to point out the absolute necessity of this breakwater, and I hope to receive the assistance and co-operation of the Government in having something done. Two thousand dollars was spent by the late Government on this work and the people of that place gave a lot of free labor towards it, and also a lot of material . Similar assistance has been given to the people of Grand Bank in building a breakwater at that place, and the benefit received from such a breakwater has indeed justified the large amount of money that was spent. Port Union was also given a breakwater and I think that it is only reasonable to give Branch the same con-

sideration. This place is open to the sea like Grand Bank, and is a very dangerous piece of sea in rough weather. I had an experience myself in Branch, and one that I shall not forget. During the election campaign last year, my colleagues and myself arrived off that port at dark. A very heavy sea was running, and in fact it was a very stormy night. The little boat we were going ashore in was almost swamped and it took all our time to keep afloat. It was very near being a fatality, and but for the assistance of the people ashore there is little doubt that we would all have been lost. The Government has not been able to give us the coastal facilities that we ask for, and yet we pay our share of the taxes just the same as the other people who have been so privileged as to receive due consideration from the Government. I ask that an inspector be sent down to Branch so that on his report something substantial will be done.

MR. SULLIVAN:—I fully endorse all Mr. Walsh says. The conditions under which the people of Branch prosecute the fishery are something wonderful. It is only when a big fresh comes that they can venture out in their boats at all. There are at present 100 motor boats opearting in Branch and the people are so keen on getting this breakwater built that they have offered to supply all the timebr which is necessary for the work. We were able to give an allocation of $2,000 for the continuation of the work last year and something was done, but it is now necessary that the work be continued immediately, because the sand will shift and the channel will fill up. That this is badly needed there is little doubt, because if it was not, the people of Branch would not go to the trouble of drawing up a petition and presenting it to this House at this late date. I have very much pleasure in supporting this petition and I hope that it will receive due consideration of the Government.

HON. MIN. OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS:—Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from the district of Trinity, asking that there be no moderation of the Prohibition Act.

MR. HIGGINS:—In the temporary absence of the two sitting members for Hr. Main, I beg to present a petition from the people of Manuels, Chamberlains and vicinity asking that there be made some rules and regulations for the keeping of sheep and goats. The farmers in that district depend on their crops for a livelihood, and, owing to the scarcity of rails, it is found impossible to keep the sheep from destroying the crops. They now ask that rules and regulations be made to keep these destroying gentry from wandering in that area. In view of the fact that there is to be an election held there shortly I think that it would be a very good policy to grant the prayer of this petition.

MR.- HIGGINS:—Notice of Ques tion.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—I have a Bill here that I would ask the House to put through its various stages. It is more or less important and deals with the Esquimaux on Labrador who have died there during the influenza epidemic and who have left certain sums of money in the hands of the Moravian Missionaries there. At present there is no law made to have it paid over and distributed to the different next of kin. I am asking the Government in this Bill to appoint an- official administrator with power to collect and distribute this money.

"An Act to provide for the collection and distribution of the estates of

certain Esquimaux Deceased" was here introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time presently.

Whereupon, the Bill entitled "An Act to provide for the collection and distribution of the estate of certain Esquimaux Deceased" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to provide for the collection and distribution of the estates of certain Esquimaux Deceased."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibs 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 the collection and distribution of the estates of certain Esquimaux Deceased" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed being entitled as above and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain Resolutions which were read a first time as follows:

Education.. .. ..$16,900.00

The said Resolutions being read a second time it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein and the said Resolutions were agreed to.

Pursuant to motion and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain Resolutions respecting a Loan for Railway Improvement and Civil Development.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Chairman, the Honourable the Minister of Finance and Customs has asked me to inform the Committee as to the object of the Bill. The position as I understand it is this: The Reid Newfoundland Company is in financial difficulties. They are unable to continue the operation of the Railway under their contract with the Government. The following is a memorandum in writing under date June 30th submitted by the Reid Newfoundland Company to the Government. I will read it for the information of the Committee and lay a copy of it upon the table of the House.

MEMORANDUM RELATIVE TO THE REID NFLD RAILWAY CO.

June 30th, 1920.

To sum up the matter in brief—The Contractors built the Railway upon the standard and specification called for by the Government which standard and specification was to meet the then (1890) requirements of the Colony, and was the standard and specification of the Placentia Junction and Hall's Bay line, which was a road built for development and settlement purposes and not with an idea for main line traffic. This is the standard and specification which is the basis of all contracts, the exception being the increasing of the weight of rail from 35lb to 50lb: but even then it was deemed necessary to lay 65lb steel on the lower end of the Placentia Road, built by the Gov-

ernment in 1888, owing to curvature and grades, which were about the same as the average for the first 150 miles between Placentia Junction and Glenwood.

No provision having been made in the Contracts for improvements over and above the standard set by the Government in 1890, and should the people of Newfoundland desire railway conditions more in keeping with the advancement and development of the trade of the country, that duty and responsibility rests with the Government and people who own the road.

The Contractors have continuously since the signing of the 1901 Contract endeavoured to improve the rolling stock and the equipment to meet the increasing traffic of the road. In this regard it may be pointed out that though the Government specifications did not call for it the cars have been equipped with steam heat, electric light up to date air brakes, automatic safety couplings, etc. Since 1915 the Company has been unable to increase its rolling stock and equipmnent in sufficient quantities to meet the abnormal demand thrown upon the railroad owing to the shortage of shipping resulting from the sale and loss of local ships during the war.

It is necessary to differentiate between the conditions of the road bed, which is owned by the Government, and the standard of which has not been improved since the Placentia Branch construction of 1888, and the condition of the rolling stock and equipment, which has been furnished by the Company, and which greatly exceeds the standard as laid down by the Government specifications under the contract.

Roling Stock, etc., of the Company from 1902 compared with 1918:

	1902	1918
Miles of Track	634.90	949.5
Tons of freight hailed	92,346	195,120
Passengers carried	125,632	298,992
Carloads ballast (1913)—389		
Carloads ballast (1919)		11,664
Sleeping cars	4	6
First class cars	13	22
Second class cars	7	21
Mail cars	4	17
Diners	3	5
Box cars	55	241
Flat cars	68	230
Snow plows	6	13
Locomotives	20	41

Tie renewals 1902-1919—3,910,500 or yearly average of 217,250 ties.

In addition to this, rotary plows, steam shovels and ditchers have been added to the equipment.

The story of the railroad situation in Newfoundland is similar to all parts of the world, where owing to the war, the increased cost of labor, materials, fuel and general operations, railroads have had to be met by increased rates or subventions or both from the various Governments.

SHAREHOLDERS LOSS:

The Shareholders of the Reid Newfoundland Company stand in an unique position, as they are practically the only Railroad shareholders in the world that had to face all the losses which were directly attributable to the war: and this could be best put in a concrete manner by a statement that the operating losses of the railway for the six years pre war, 1908-1913, amounted to $363,057.12, against the loss in the six year war period, 1914-1919, of $1,544,429.13, which makes a difference of net loss to the concern and the owners of it of $1,280,000, which los is directly attributable to the war.

UNITED STATES CONDITIONS:

In the United States the net loss to the Government of operating the railroads during Federal control amount-

ed to $900,478,000 and this was met by the tax payers of the country. In addition to this the railways of the United States have appeared before the Interstate Commerce Commission and asked for an increase in freight rates which will aggregate annually $1,017,000,000.

CANADA:

The story of Canada's railways is too well known to deal with at length, but the net loss on operating the Government roads last year was in the neighbourhood of $60,000,000, and with the addition of the Grand Trunk this year, the Minister of Railways admits it is hard to estimate what the tax payers wll have to meet.

WAR INDEMNITY:

Owing to the shortage of shipping greater burdens were placed upon the Newfoundland Railway than it was ever intended to bear and it has entailed considerable depreciation in the road bed and rails owned by the Government, so much so that should the Dominion of Newfoundland enter a complete claim for indemnity against Germany it would be fair to include in this the re-railing of the road as well as the losses sustained by the owners during the war, namely $1,280,000.

The losses on the Reid Newfoundlan Railway operation for twenty years amount to $3,265,116.34.

To give an idea of the relative increase and development of the Dominion of Newfoundland the following figures are of interest.

	1901	1919
Total Trade ..	$16,606,491	$70,081,800
Revenue	2,060,581	9,535,725
Trade of Canada	2,489,499	12,777.684

It is fundamental to the question and it must be clearly borne in mind that the operating expenses of a transportation system in any country must, if efficient service is to be given, be paid for by the people of that country. The contracts for railroad construction were conceived with the idea of colonization and settlement of the Dominion, and entered into both by the Contractors and the Government with this idea in view, and on the whole attained their object, the losses being comparatively small. The situation created by the war is an abnormal one not contemplated by either party, and has brought about condition where unforeseen happenings beyond control of human beings render a review of the situation in the interest of the country advisable.

The reasons for the road bed being in a run down condition are because in the first instance the standard laid down according to the contract was never sufficiently high for a main line traffic road and was adopted ostensibly with a view to the colonization of the country. Secondly the Company, with the Government's consent, in order to try and meet the increasing demands upon the railroad with the growing trade of the Colony, placed heavier locomotives and rolling stock on the road, which has proved after some years of experience to have been too great a strain on the rails and road bed, but both the Company and the Government conceived they were acting in the best interest of the country by so doing.

Had conditions remained as they were prior to the war the Company could no doubt have carried on the operation of the road, but the heavy increase of traffic which had to be taken care of on account of the lack of shipping and the abnormal increase in the cost of operation both as to materials, wages and fuel, have placed the road in such a position

that since 1914 the following losses on operation have been made:

LOSSES IN OPERATION

1914	$171,445.81
1915	167,176.84
1916	134,137.63
1917	108,843.97
1918	317,275.86
1919	645,549.02
	$1,544,429.13

COAL FOR LOCOMOTIVES

1915	$164,693.58
1916	191,238.27
1917	294,105.50
1918	365,436.59
1919	586,227.29

RAILWAY PAY ROLL

1915	$507,444.32
1916	593,561.79
1917	737,295.77
1918	928,648.18
1919	1,249,937.48

COAL COST REDUCTION:

The Coal bill for the road increased from $164,000 in 1915 to $586,000 in 1919, but should the contemplated development of the St. George's coal areas under the Government be completed and the Coal on the track cost the estimated figure of $4 per ton a saving on the Coal bill for the operating of the road can be effected amounting to close on $280.000 and as Coal has already made several advances since January 1st, it is safe to assume that with the production of St. George's Coal a saving in operation of the railroad might be effected to the extent of $350,000 per annum.

The increase in revenue for the road for 1919 over the year 1914 was $645,051.86. The increase of operating expenses for the same period is $1,159,813.25 and the loss for the same period shows an increase of only $471,103.21. It must be quite apparent that the result could only have been achieved by careful management under very difficult circumstances.

As to whether the statements contained in this memorandum are correct or not I do not know. As to what the financial position of the Reid Newfoundland Company is I do not know. I do know, however, that the system has not been satisfactorily operated for some considerable time, and it appears to be now on the point of absolute collapse. The railway system is a public utility which must be cperated. It may be handled in one of three ways. First, by the Reid Newfoundland Company going into liquidation and a receiver being appointed with power to temporarily operate the railroad until matters betwen the company and the Government and other creditors are adjusted. The second way is for the Government to take over the rail line and then get down to the proposition of making such adjustments as it is possible for them to make with the Reid Newfoundland Company for their breach of contract. So far as I understand the position, that is the method which the Reid Newfoundland Company would refer to have adopted. The third way to deal with the matter is by temporary arrangements under which the rail line would be operated by a joint commission, not a Government Commission, but a Commission upon which the Government would have representatives and the Reid Newfoundland Company representatives. Representatives of the Reid Newfoundland Company have had several interviews with a Committee of Council and have laid before them their position, the memorandum just read being a statement submitted by the Reid Newfoundland Company to Committee of Council as setting forth their position. I understand that Mr. H. D. Reid has also

had a considerable number of interviews with individual members of Council, so that the whole matter might be discussed, and, so far as possible, all the members of Council, none of whom are railroad experts, might become acquainted with the railroad situation of the Colony. It is quite probable that some temporary arrangements will be made with the Reid Newfoundland Company for the operation of the railway for the coming fiscal year.

Of the million and a half loan proposed in this bill $1,000,000 is for railway purposes and is intended to be devoted to railway improvements. The remaining sum of half a million dollars is intended for coal development work primarily in connection with railway operation. The St. George's Coal Fields, Ltd., owns a property upon which very satisfactory reports have been received from geologists as to the probability of its containing a large quantity of coal suitable for both railway and domestic purpose. It is also regarded as a satisfactory gas coal. Mr. Howley's report upon the area have been very encouraging. Mr. Forbes, of the Reid Newfoundland Company, who is a capable geologist ,reports that in his opinion there is not less than a million and a half tons of coal capable of being worked. Through the courtesy of Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Borden, Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Dowling, who is probably the leading geologist of British North America in the matter of the investigation of coal areas, visited Newfoundland and has given the Government a report which indicates that here is a very large quantity of workable coal in this area The proposition in connection with this half million dollars is that if satisfactory arrangements can be made with the St. George's Coal Fields, Ltd., the Government will undertake coal operations in this area, the supply of coal being used primarily for railway purposes, but also for domestic purposes and the production of gas, if it is found that the coal can be mined and delivered in St. John's at a satisfactory price.

The policy of the Government in connection with the operation of the railroad during the coming year and the matter of the coal areas has not been decided upon, but the object of the bill is to provide a million and a half dollars, all of which is primarily for railroad purposes, it being intended, so far as any definite policy has been under consideration that $1,000,000 shall be appropriated for railway improvements and the remaining half millions for the development of the St. George's Coal Fields, Ltd., for the purpose of providing a coal supply as indicated above.

It will be noted that the Bill provides that bonds shall be for a period of ten years and the interest shall not exceed six per cent.

I fully appreciate the fact that the honourable members opposite have taken the position on a number of occasions that to deal with this entire railroad problem will mean an expenditure of nine or ten million dollars, and the idea of a Loan Bill of a million and a half will undoubtedly be the subject of ridicule. I have merely to say that this is a provisional measure to enable the Government to do something towards the improvement of the rail line and make it approach in some slight measure a workable railroad. When the Legislature next meets full information should be available as to the condition of the rail line, and its cost of operation, and I hope it will then be possible for the whole position to be fully and intelligently discussed by the House.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—On behalf of the Oposition, I ask that the Committee rise and report progress, so as to give us time to consider this matter, as this is a very important Bill because of the fact that the sum of one and one- half million dollars is involved, and there is no reason why this should not stand over for twenty-four hours to allow us time to consider the matter.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—That is a very reasonable request. I move that the Committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again to-morrow.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman of the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred and had made some progress and asked leave to sit again on to morrow.

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

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act further to amend the Revenue Act, 1905"

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

THE HON. THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—While the first three parts of the Bill (An Act to further amend the Revenue Act, 1905) have already been considered by the Committee of the Whole on Ways and Ways and Means, I would like to explain the other portion of the Bill, namely, section four. Some time ago the postal rates were increased by adding one cent, and as Newfoundland forms part of the Universal Postal News. and as we have put on one cent extra postage without consulting those countries concerned, we have been asked by the Colonial Office to put in this section so that those countries that compose the Universal Postal News shall not be slighted. As some of us in Newfoundland know, Newfoundland was included in the Universal Postal Convention. The Canadian Government is doing the same thing.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Before passing this Bill (An Act to further amend the Revenue Act, 1905) I would like to point out that while the Budget was being criticised from this side for ten hours several questions were asked in reference to it, and the information asked for has not been given. The Prime Minister was absent while the Budget was being discussed and the Minister in charge of the Budget left the House for eight hours while this document was before us. There are several things in the Budget which are absolutely necessary for this House and the Country to know. And while I am not intending to go over the same ground I do say that it is not fair to this House or to the people of the country to allow this Bill to go through without getting this necessary information asked for. Now in looking over the Auditor General's Report I notice there is at last a surplus of $3,314,638. It would be interesting to the Opposition to know the intention of the Government in this direction, what is its disposition towards this amount of surplus. Is it the intention to put this amount to the credit of the Government at the Bank of Montreal, or does it intend to spend it in addition to the $1,500,000 asked for in this Loan Bill before the House? Surely you do not expect the House to close without giving the members on this side of the House this necessary information. It is the usual custom of the Minister in charge of the Budget

to explain all these matters with detail. We did not treat the Opposition in this manner when we were on the Government side of the House, and we do not expect the Government to treat us differently. I would like to hear the Prime Minister tell us what is the intention of the Government with reference to this $3,300,000. You come in and ask for this loan of $1,500,000 with this amount already to your credit. Are you going to leave it there to your credit or what? I think some time ago I asked the Minister of Shipping about the Coastal Boats Ss. Prospero and Ss. Portia. I have heard nothing about this matter, and I also asked for information about the accounts. This also has not been answered. We would like to know what position you are in financially in this matter. When the ships were taken over we were in credit and it is only fair to us, and we are entitled to see those accounts dealing with those two boats. They were purchased for two hundred thousand dollars each and it was paid out of the surplus mentioned in the Auditor General's report. The amount for arbitration in reference to the Reid Newfoundland Company was also paid out of this surplus. This information should be given voluntarily and it must be given before these Resolutions pass the House. This is part of the procedure and these accounts should have been laid on the table of the House. I would like the Minister of Finance to explain about those figures.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:— In dealing with this matter, I am speaking from memory and am consequently able to quote round figures only. The Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Bond's reserve of half a million dollars was entirely exhausted by the late Government prior to the end of the fiscal year 1916-1917. On the first of July, 1917, there was neither reserve nor surplus. The revenues for the fiscal year which expired on the 30th day of June, 1918, were exceptionally good, due to the largely increased cost of goods and the fact that our duty was an ad valorem duty, combined with the proceeds of special War taxation. There was consequently a substantial surplus. War expenses were paid by Loans and the Surplus was put to the credit of Surplus Trust Account as at the first of July, 1918. Of this sum, amounting to $1,170,000, during the year 1918-19 there was expended $1,-125,000, representing $725,000 for railway purposes and $400,000 for the purchase of the "Prospero" and "Portia," leaving a credit to the Surplus Trust Account on the first of July, 1919, of $45,000. The surplus of revenue over current expenditure, not including War Account which was still handled out of War Loans, for the year 1918-19 which expired on the 30th day of June, 1919, was $2,769,000, which gave a credit balance on Surplus Trust Account as at the first day of July, 1919, of $2,814,000. Out of this $12,-814,000 the late Government appropriated the famous half-million "Corruption Fund" for electioneering purposes, the actual amount appropriated being $1,497,000. This is the money which was squandered throughout the country during the months of September and October of last year and for which a value not exceeding ten per cent of the expenditure was secured or can ever expect to be secured. There was an amount of about $1,800 paid the Reid Newfoundland Company in connection with certain claims of theirs, $5,000 was transferred to the Department of Agriculture and Mines in connection with Railway Arbitration, and the present Administration purchased the S.S. "Watchful" for $63,-000 and, on the certificate of the High Commissioner in London, about $23,-

000 was paid for expenses in connection with the "Watchful" and the two steamers which had been donated by the British Government to Newfoundland. Then the Militia Department had to be provided with funds. They required $1,000,000. $400,000 was available on account of last Loan, $200,000 from other Loan Accounts, and to make up the total amount required the sum of $400,000 was taken from the Surplus Trust Account, pending the raising of a further War Loan if such should be found necessary on the final adjustment of War liability and the possible refunding, in such an event, of this amount of $400,000 withdrawn. This made a total debit of $993,000, leaving a balance to the credit of Surplus Trust Account as at the 30th day of June, 1920, of $1,720,-000. The Auditor General informs me that the Estimated Surplus on 1919-1920 account will be approximately three million dollars, as against which there will be substantial war liabilities to be liquidated at least temporarily out of that account.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Chairman, it was brough to my notice that certain candy manufacturers in the city can purchase sugar at much lower prices than small buyers. I understand that the F. B. Wood Company can buy it from four to five cents a pound cheaper. This information was given me by a manufacturer of candy. Now there is another matter that I want to mention. Some time ago I made enquiry regarding the suspension of the Inspector of Customs, Mr. McGrath. Now I understand that Mr. McGrath is still under suspension, if not dismissed. The Minister of Finance and Customs says that there have been no other steps taken. Mr. Chairman, I want to place myself on record as being absolutely opposed to this conduct of the Government towards Mr. McGrath, and I consider it my duty to state right here my opposition to this conduct. Two and a half centuries ago two gentlemen on the Irish coast packed their bags and left for the New World. These two gentlemen were McGrath and Walsh, and it is a strange coincidence that one of the descendants should find it his duty to get up in his place in this House and denounce what has been done to the other descendant.

The McGrath family has been prominent in the public life of Newfoundland. The father for five years held a seat in this House of Assembly. Asociated with him were other gentlemen who did themselves credit in representing their districts. He was followed by his son, a brother of the man who is now under discussion. The name of McGrath is respected all over the district of Placentia and St. Mary's. When Mr. James McGrath retired his place was taken by Mr. R. T. McGrath, and in 1900 he was elected a member of the Libertl Party. In 1904 he was again elected under Sir Robert Bond, and in 1908 he went down to defeat. He was later appointed Stipendiary Magistrate and was appointed Inspector of Customs in 1915, and now we find that this man who has been so closely connected with public life of this Colony has been practically driven out of office without a hearing.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, and had passed the Bill with some amendment.

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

Whereupon, 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.

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 following Bills sent up entitled respectively "An Act to confirm a Contract on the Subject of the Manufacture of Paper Pulp and Wood Products" and "An Act Respecting the Dominion Co-operative Building Association Limited" without amendment.

Hon. the Prime Minister tabled Report of the Government Engineer upon the Government Railways for year 1919—

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into a Commiteee of the Whole on Supply—

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—When I was in the Department of Finance and Customs I knew about Mr. LeMessurier and about every official in that Department, but I didn't allow Mr. LeMessurier or anybody else to run me when I was there, and I took no statement from anybody until I found out whether it was correct or not. If the present Minister of Finance had followed in my footsteps in that direction concerning the case of Mr. McGrath he would not now be in the position that he finds himself in the House to-day. The facts as I know them are that Mr. McGrath sent in a requisition for $150 to go West and inspect the Customs around to Port aux Basques and do down the West Coast. He brought that requisition to Mr. LeMessurier who refused to O. K. it. Mr. McGrath then took it to the Finance Minister, who told him that he would see about it and the requisition remained in the possession of the Finance Minister. Later on a Mr. Sterling was sent North to do Customs work. To this Mr. McGrath objected before the Minister of Finance, pointing out that it was his work that Mr. Sterling was sent to. Mr. McGrath was told to see Mr. LeMessurier about it. Now these gentlemen did not see eye to eye with each other and the altercation, which we are discussing to-night, took place. At the wind up of it McGrath was suspended within an hour and without any hearing. Later on Mr. LeMessurier wrote to the Finance Minister pointing out that he thought Mr. McGrath had gone West and that he had signed a cheque for him to go West. Later Mr. LeMessurier was allowed to take back that letter to the Finance Minister, and wrote another letter. On enquiry it was found that Mr. LeMessurier was not correct in his statement and that Mr. McGrath could not go West, because he could not go without money to pay his expenses. Mr. McGrath was still in his office, a fact that was known to Mr. LeMessurier,- although Mr. LeMessurier put up that statement, and it was known to the Minister of Finance. Another man was put over Mr. McGrath's head and given the necessary funds to go North or West, as desired. Do you call that the right and proper treatment to dole out to a man of Mr. McGrath's intelligence and experience and standing in the community. After the altercation took place you ordered Mr. LeMessurier to write a leter to Mr. McGrath suspending him. Now to be fair to Mr. LeMessurier and Mr. McGrath and all

the other officials of that department, I might say, that for the ten years or so that I was in charge there, that if I wrote letters for all the requests that I got from Mr. LeMessurier and all the other Misters down there without enquiry, I would have been kept busy all the time in this particular direction and I would have had probably the whole staff suspended. But I never allowed Mr. LeMessurier or anybody else there to dictate to me. When Mr. LeMessurier made charges against any official I always waited to hear the other side of it, and very often Mr. LeMessurier was in the wrong. And Mr. LeMessurier is in the wrong to-day, because the very letter that he wrote proves it. You had right to give Mr. McGrath a hearing in his own defence. You intimated to Mr. McGrath that politics was the cause of the trouble.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—If Mr. McGrath took it in that way he is laboring under a false impression.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—It was not your place to chase after Mr. McGrath and coax him to come back. That was not altogether in keeping with the dignity of the position which you hold. What you should have done was to order an inquiry into the matter. You should have written Mr McGrath to that effect and heard the evidence from both sides. You have not done justice to that department nor to some of the officials of that department like what was done by the heads of some of the other departments towards their officials. Take the Agriculture and Mines Department where the recommendations of the Commission appointed to enquire into salaries of civil servants was followed regarding increases. In your department you have increased salaries contrary to the recommendations of the Commission and you have decreased salaries contrary to the recommendations of the Commission. Take Mr. O'Reilly's case. After you were cornered and it was pointed out to you that you were doing him an injustice, you asked to have the vote held over in the Estimates. Apparently now you are increasing Mr. O'Reilly's salary. Take Mr. LeMessurier, the Cashier, you did not give him a raise; and Mr. Fox, who holds a very important position. Take Mr. McGrath. You reduced his salary and I know how you reduced it. The reason is Mr. LeMessurier took charge of you and whatever salary he told you to reduce you reduced. You did worse than that; you went to Ferryland district and you dismissed thre or four tide-waiters there. This, in my opinion, is low down and contemptible treatment. Take the tide-waiter at Bay Bulls. With nothing against him you dismissed him forthwith. To-day Bay Bulls is suffering because you are not prepared to put another man there. This is one of the principal parts of our district and necessitates having a tidewaiter all the time, because American vessels are contiually coming there at this time from Gloucester bound for the Northern Banks. You went to Renews and dismissed a man at the instance of Mr. LeMessurier, because I know that Mr. LeMessurier was after this man for years. Read the recommendations of Inspectors O'Reilly and Dee, under whose care this unfortunate man Brazil was, and you wil find that he was dismissed solely on the recommendation of Mr. LeMessurier. Why did you not enquire into the matter? Take the man at Caplin Bay who never interfered in politice and who gave entire satisfaction, who was dismissed without warning, and you put an incapable in his place. This was done by the wire-pulling of one Hartery, a defeated candidate.

These are samples of who is running your department. LeMessurier is in charge of the department. While I refrain from saying too much of LeMessurier, there are many stories that I could tell of LeMessurier which would prove interesting. One of these stories, as referred to here this evening, happened at Bonavista, and it got the Customs into a bad mess last year. Before Mr. LeMessurier leaves on his long vacation get him to tell you the story and then ask the old man Templeman of Bonavista to witness it, after that I will ask you to go to a picture show and see if you can find anything to beat it. I do not blame you. I know that you do not know anything about the department. This man McGrath whom you have thrown on the street was a member of this Assembly when you had short clothes on. Each and every individual down there that served you in politics got their salaries increased as high as 100 per cent, while those who did not agree with you politically have to suffer. This brings me back to the discussion before the chair this evening and of the Speaker's opinion of that principle. Take the young man DeLacey, referred to here the other day. His case was indecently handled in my estimation. This is a poor chap, afflicted by God, whose two brothers went out and offered to lay down their lives for you and me, yet you have not dismissed those drawing $2,000 and $3,000 a year. No, you have courted and are courting those, while the heads are cut off Brazil, Day and DeLacey. And this is how the Government of the day have abided by the decision of the Commission appointed to adjust salaries and increases. That is the apparent object and that is the platform of the Government, to dismiss the ordinary civil servants that took part in politics, but Mr. Salter, whom you used politically, you put him in one of the best positions you got to offer. And it appears that our Speaker endorses this principle very strongly, according to the statement that he made this evening concerning the firing of Mr. McCarthy on the street. It reminds me of a quotation that I read in the history of the late Judge Prowse, which suits a number of members of this House and which reads as follows:

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—Of course that was written to mean both sides of the House.

SIR. M. P. CASHIN:—It's possible, though not probable. Well now, after reading that indictment of the late Judge Prowse, and then to go back a few months and think of the promises made by the great Liberal-Reform Party, with the accent on the word Reform, and to come on the other side of the House, one would be inclined, in my judgment, to agree with what that deceased gentleman wrote. But before taking my seat, I would like to point out to the Minister of Finance that, in justice to Mr. McGrath, he should be given a hearing. You should appoint a Commission—Commissions are the order of the day just now you know—and allow that Commission to hear the evidence of Mr. LeMessurier and Mr. McGrath and then abide by the report of that Commission. I repeat that it is not in keeping with the dignity of the position of the Minister of Finance to go to Mr. McGrath and ask him to wait until Mr. LeMessurier moves out temporarily and then slinge back into office. That is what was done by the Minister of Finance. I know enough of Mr. McGrath, and I know all the McGraths, and I think that, in my opinion at least, he will not be found to have his position handled in this fashion, and that he

would much prefer to jeopardize his job rather than act on the recommendation, as already referred to, of the Finance Minister. If you are just and fair or trying to be just and fair to Mr. McGrath, appoint a Commission. Get their report and then deal with Mr. McGrath according to that report. That is all I have to say on the matter. The other matters will come up again to-morrow or next day.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest and attention to the remarks of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition. I answered every question put to me as truthfully as I could and, with his permission, I would like to ask him one or two questions later on in the debate. However, his own admission will show whether it was spite or spleet on my part because of the friendly relationship existing between the Hon. member and Mr. McGrath that I dismissed Mr. McGrath or not. Your own very answer will prove that such is not the case. With regard to the dismissals on the Southern Shore, I may say that I answered some of them on a previous occasion in this House. With reference to Mr. Brazil, I may say that that gentleman was receiving a salary of $820 a year, and besides that amount he was receiving one dollar per day board money while on shore. When I took over the office I discovered that Brazil was on shore for at least five or six months out of the year.

SIR E. P. CASHIN:—Not more than four months at the outside; he used to be engaged in other parts of the country doing Customs work.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—Admitting that he was four months unoccupied in Ferryland district receiving the salary mentioned and an extra dollar a day, I did not consider that the man was earning his salary. It was not in any spirit of spite or spleen that I removed Brazil.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—On economy?

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—If I wanted to remove friends of the late Government for their politics, I doubt if there would be a civil servant left all along the Southern Shore.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—There are not many of them left there now.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—With regard to the other friends of the Hon. member, I have not interfered with them in their positions. Regarding the Tidewaiter at Bay Bulls I decided to have the business there done by the Sub-Collector. I do not know who this man Day is, or what his politics are.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—I am sorry you dismissed him on the recommendation of Mr. LeMessurier.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—I did no such thing. I felt that his services there would be fully carried out by the Sub-Collector, without a Tidewaiter. If I find out that the business there warrants a Tidewaiter I will appoint one. As to the appointment to Aquaforte, I think that the hon. member will agree that we made this possibly to our own detriment, as the official whose name is Winsor was a friend of yours.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—It is a- terrible compliment to appoint young Winsor, who fought and bled for you. I think that it is the height of impertinence on your part to get up and mention his name.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—I have my strong doubts if you would have appointed him if he was up against you in politics, and we know of some of the appointments that you made in the nature of misfits for that matter.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Mention one.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—

I can mention several if I liked. The Commission said that some of your appointments were too old and unfit for the work they were called upon to perform.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—I challenge you to mention one. Any appointments I made I am prepared to sand by them now. I never refused to appoint a returned soldier anyhow.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—What about Mr. Chafe? He was opposed to this Government.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—And what about that notorious slacker Foley? Did you want the old man Chafe, who sent three sons to war, to go himself too? You were young enough to go yourself, but didn't.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—You must know a lot about my age.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—There were men older than you went. The old man Best, who was over 60 years of age went, and you should have gone.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—He went with the Forestry Battalion.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—You would be better in the woods, too.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—I would be as good as you are any day, either in the woods or in here; and I can prove that. The day that the statement is made here, as was made about you a few years ago, I will walk out through those doors.

SIR M. P. CASHI:—Its another mater to produce the proof yong man. You put this Colony to the expense of $15,000 to try and prove these charges and you did not acomplish your task yet; you are still searching for the proof. Now don't lose your temper.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—I am not losing my temper and it is a good thing for you that I am not. I want to say that I have answered every question asked me truthfully since I have been sitting in this chair. Every man, woman and child in this country knows that since the opening days of this session you have been persecuting the Prime Minister and myself; you are not after anybody else but us two.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—We are going to make you do what is right. You know the reason and I have told you already in this House the reason.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—You are not able to tell me anything. You made statements in this House that are not correct. Twenty years ago you made statements that you had to retract and statements were made against you that were not taken back. I want to ask if it is not correct that you suspended two or three men in the Customs Department without enquiry. Well then, is it wrong for me to do likewise? Have I not, as one man to another, done all I could to get Mr. McGrath back in his office, clear of any political animosity whatever. In fact you have admitted yourself that I stooped below the dignity of my office to try and get him back. I took the same attitude in suspending McGrath as you took in suspending other men in that department. When you suspended those men you found afterwards that you took a wrong step, but up to the present I find that I have not taken a wrong step. No man, either LeMessurier or Keating is going to run me in that office. I admit that I went into politics practically a new man. I went into it unsolicited. I did not seek politics; politics sought me. I do not like the dirty game. Since I went into that department I tried to do what is just and fair for the country's betterment and I am going to continue trying to do it. I have recommended an increase for every man in that department. I will leave it to my friends in the Executive if

I did not agitate for an increase of $100 for Mr. McGrath, and it was only after strong agitation that I got it. Is that the attitude of a man using spite and spleen against McGrath. All the increases that I looked for I could not get. Every Departmental Head in the Government sought increases, they got some but could not get all. I want to say once and for all that I have acted fair and square in that department and to every individual in it. I stood up for men whom I knew had strong party feelings and inclinations towards members on the other side of the House. One of them in particular was a messenger drawing $1150 a year. I had the fight of my life to keep that official's salary at $1150. I want to say for the last time that I have been as fair and square as I could in that department. With regard to Mr. O'Reilly, everything that happened in his department was not to be known to the members on the other side of the House or to the public at large. Mr. O'Reilly was to see me a short time before the Estimates were made. He pointed out that there were certain duties in connection with his office that he looked upon as legal work and might have entailed the services of a professional man and he asked me for a certain allowance for doing it. I upt the matter before the Executive, as Estimates were on and I did not know what was in the Estimates with regard to the salary of Mr. O'Reilly. But when recommendations came from the other side and acting upon the report of the Commission, I placed the matter then before the Executive. After seeing Mr. O'Reilly they gave him an increase that met his views. I, consequently, allowed him $3600 per year instead of any allowance for any additional work. I want to state here that whatever Mr. O'Reilly politics were was immaterial to me. Since my entry into that department I have always tried to do what is right and fair, irrespective of politics. I admitted here at the opening of the session that my parliamentary experience was nil, but I am not unwilling to learn when I am in the right school.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Mr. Chairman Just a word or two in reply, pointing to the economy applied by the Finance Minister regarding Ferryland District. Tidewaiter Brazil was paid $800 a year whcih is less than the ordinary laborer on the wharf can earn and far less than what a fisherman can earn in four months. And still the Minister tries to justify himself by saying that the $800 paid Brazil who was engaged on the Fiona and other boats on the Protection Service Work in connection with the Colony, was too much. But as soon as the new Minister struck his department , Brazil, who has no black mark against him and in whom no fault was found, gets his head cut off, so to speak. With regard to Mr. Brazil, I would like to make it clear that, although he did not spend the whole of the season on the "Fiona," he worked as Tidewaiter and when the "Fiona" was otherwise engaged he was sent to various parts of the Island for similar work.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—Pardon me for interrupting, but Mr. LeMessurier did not hand in any recommendation to me for the removal of Mr. Brazil.

SIR M. P. CASHIN:—Take now the man at Aquaforte. Mr. Windsor was the officer there but he died during the month of April of the present year. Mr. Windsor sent two sons to War. They went with first contingent. Windsor died in April, I recommended Mark Windsor, but he was not appointed to this position, although the

position was not a very important one, the salary being but $300. Windsor was only a poor man doing a small business of his own at the time. Evidently you would wish to bring me under a great compliment to you for having suggested the appointment of Mr. Windsor to this position, but I realized that Mr. Windsor was fully entitled to this position, not alone in that he had been a returned soldier, but that his father had occupied the position before him. There was no charge of any kind against him that should deter him from getting this appointment, whereas there were many things in his favor which should have induced the Government to place him in the position which had been vacated.

The Minister of Finance has stated this evening that he removed Mr. Brazil under a plea of economy. Mr. Brazil had done his duty and given every satisfaction. No charges had been preferred against him and it seems strange to me that the Government should retrench in this way by dismissing tidewaiters who were receiving small salaries, as a method of economy, just as the Minister of Public Works, who sits next the Minister, started by a line of economy in the purchase of splits for his department. The Finance Minister dismissed Brazil because he felt that he had not supported the Government, and removed Brazil from the Public Service because in his opinion the salary he was receiving was too great a strain on the finances of the Colony. There are others now who are getting much more in the matter of increases than Mr. Brazil's whole salary, but the Minister is now feeling uncomfortable because these matters are shown up to him. If anybody were to look at him to-night they would find that he is considerably tormented. He has made the charge that he and the Leader of the Government were the only two on the other side of the House who were being persecuted by me and other members on this side. I do not know that either of these gentlemen can justify that attitude in the light of their conduct towards me during the recent election. If I have anything to say in the House I am prepared to say it right here from my place in the House. I do not run away, but the Prime Minister is always ready to leave the Assembly when I rise to criticize any action of the Government in which he is immediately concerned. If he and the Finance Minister had had the common sense and common decency, after the General Election, to take up the matters of the various departments and forget what has happened during the election, they would not have had the trouble of defending a by-election in St. John's West because we would have permitted them to be returned by acclamation, but as soon as they got in their departments they started rummaging for information, thinking they would find a mare's nest and that they would succeed in putting the Cashin crowd in jail. They boasted openly that this would be their attitude towards the members on this side of the House. . What has happened? The Minister of Finance and Customs prostituted his department by producing information with regard to certain individuals who were concerned in the raising of the Loan for the Colony and handing that information to the, Prime Minister thinking that in so doing they would damaged me in the eyes of the public. I have no objection to the Minister furnishing any information that would be considered useful to him in the interests of his election in St. John's West, but I think that when dealing with information of this class

he should have represented matters fairly and not unjustly. Not alone did the Minister search all the records of the Finance and Customs Department, but the Government turned down the Auditor-General and imported two detectives, costing about $12,000, to go thoroughly into all the public accounts to find, if possible, any charges of dishonesty against the late Government. They started a campaign of villification through the Daily Star, claiming that a shocking state of things existed in all the Departments. They sent this news broadcast, not alone through the country, but they aired it outside this Colony in Canada and the United States, thinking to damage the reputation of those who had been associated with the late Government for so many years. After making those charges against me, charges which they in no sense could corroborate or prove, they now squeal because I take the position here of defending myself against the malicious statements they have made. The Prime Minister, while he is prepared to use the "Star" to villify me, is not prepared to come to this House and make similar charges from his seat on that side of the House, nor is he prepared to in any way endorse the charges made repeatedly by the organ of the Government. He has dragged my name through the "Star" and has handed out information most damaging to the reputation of all members of the late Government. The Finance Minister obtained in the Finance Department the names of those who were connected with the raising of the National Loan. There were several names on that list, including business men, financial agents, banks, and other commercial institutions, but they singled out the name of my child, who was also one of those who received a slight commission for raising a part of that loan. They made it appear in the public press and they made it appear upon the public platform that no other person had received any commission, and the Prime Minister did not hesitate to state before a public meeting in St. John's West that those of my immediate family were the ones who had received consideration at my hands. insinuating that some dishonesty had been aimed at by me in connection with that loan. Both the Finance Minister and the Prime Minister featured this particular matter all through the District, and the people of St. John's West could not be blamed if they accepted that statement which the present Prime Minister handed out. It was a cowardly attempt to villify me but I have since shown through a statement which I read before this House, that there were over thirty people in connection with that loan who had received a similar rate of commission for the raising of the loan and the people of St. John's West now know that those statements, made at that time, were as false as any other statement made with regard to the present Government. The Finance Minister denies that he ever made any attack upon me or upon my family, but if he did not make the statement he heard Mr. Squires make it and, knowing it was false, made no attempt to contradict it. This is the reason why I have strongly criticised the Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister from my place in the House. I have nothing to say to any. other member of the Government or any other supporter of the Governement on the other side of the House. I consider that the others fought a clean fight, that they won by honorable means, and I am not one of those who would deny them the credit that is due them for putting up a success-

ful fight. I would have had the same feelings towards the other two gentlemen to whom I refer if they had acted like men, and if they had not made false charges against me I would not now be dealing with them in the manner that I am. In the Majestic Theatre, the Prime Minister announced to the public on the eve of polling day that my daughter received certain commissions, insinuating in a way that she had received stolen property, but next to her name on that list was that of Sir Edgar Bowring, to whom no reference whatever was made. This is why I condemned the action of the Finance Minister and the Prime Minister, because I feel that they acted disgracefully in connection with the whole matter, that they made statements which they knew were false, regarding me, and they had not the manliness to correct those charges either there or at any other time since. Men of this class are generally the first to squirm and cry for mercy. I can now bring the different issues of the "Star" containing the charges made by the Prime Minister and Minister of Finance against me and my family. I have satisfied this House, I think, on the matter, that all the charges made with regard to me are false and that they were made for one puspose, the purpose of deceiving the electorate, that with them the end justified the means, and that they are not yet prepared to offer that apology which would be necessary from gentlemen for their infamous conduct in the matter. The Finance Minister said he did not know or understand the statements in that Budget. He is excited, and, to give emphasis to his statement, he pounds the desk and declares to the House and the country that he is an honest man, but he should not consider or try to convey the impression that there are no other honest men. The Budget has been torn to pieces by the criticism of the Opposition, and there is not a man on the other side of the House to defend it. The Minister of Finance is the man in charge who should be able to defend his statements contained in that Budget. But, instead of doing so, he stands up here pleading for mercy, because he does not know anything about the position which he holds. He should be able to explain fully every detail of the Estimates. He shoud come in here with a detailed statement of every amount contained in those Estimates. He is expected to give this House every information, but he is unable to do so. He said that we are persecuting himself and Mr. Squires. We admit that we have criticized both these gentlemen, and I have already given the why. Those reasons should impress themselves upon them so that in future they may be able to pursue a different course and treat Members of this House with that respect which is due them. We came to this House to deal fairly with all matters which came before the Legislature, but the attitude of the Government, particularly of the Minister and Prime Minister, has convinced us that our proper attitude in the future will be to call a spade a spade, to speak out plainly, which we intend to do from this out. Whilst I have a seat in this House I will not be prevented from criticizing in a manner which I consider proper, any measure brought before this House by any Member of the Government, and I now say that if the Prime Minister and Finance Minister serve their country during their term of office as creditably as I have done during my time, that they will have nothing to regret, and that I feel that I resigned my office with a clean record.

Getting back to the matter to which I referred, Mr. Brazil's dismissal, I would point out that Mr. Brazil was receiving $800 per year, that he had a family of eight children and a wife to support. If the Government intended to economise by dismissing him and saving $800 it does not seem consistent that they should come in here and vote $30,000 for themselves and vote the Departmental Heads $4,000 each; and further, whilst the Commission stated that- no Depart metal Head holding more than one position should receive more than $6,000, still Mr. Squires is prepared to accept two such positions, meaning $8,000 and perquisites, which further increases his salary to at least $12,000. Brazil was a competent official who did his work honestly and earnestly, but because he was blamed for supporting me—and this I cannot confirm with regard to him—he had to be dismissed. If this is the kind of politics which the present Government intend to follow, the statement which I have referred to to-night, made some time ago with reference to the Legislature and contained in the history of Judge Prowse, applies to the present Government. Last Fall the present Government denounced the Reid Newfoundland Company violently and held them up to public ridicule. They claimed that when returned to power they would keep the Reid Newfoundland Company up to their contract and see that the railroad was put in first-class condition. To-day we have a Loan Bill introduced here to help that Company out of its present difficulties. The Finance Minister would be expected to introduce his Loan Bill, but he is evidently not competent to deal with it and unable to pilot it to the House, so he is compelled to hand it over to the Prime Minister, who last year denounced so violently the whole Reid outfit. Take the attitude of the 'Star' which is the organ of the Prime Minister, and what do we find? We found them stating day after day previous to the election and since the election that they would do everything to put the Reids in their places They would compel the Company to operate the railroad in a satisfactory manner and claimed that if the Company had not the means to repair it, the Government would take it over and run it properly. I am now reminding them of their attitude during the last eight months. That attitude has entirely changed and in the last hours of the session, under suspended rules, this Loan Bill is introduced. The Prime Minister to-day stated, in introducing the Bill, that the Government had no confidence in the directorate of the Reid Newfoundland Company. Still he is prepared to introduce this Bill to give them a million dollars of the public funds of the Colony to help them out of their difficulties. This is not consistent with the attitude of the Prime Minister in his appeal to the electorate last Fall. His attitude then was the attitude of a man who would go to any limits to deceive the people in order that he may obtain power and enrich himself at the public expense. There are many statements in his Manifesto which are not in keeping with his position in this House to-day. Many men on the other side of the House must certainly sympathize with the Prime Minister in finding him compelled to introduce this Bill in the manner in which he did. During the last moments of the Session he is asking for a loan to put the railroad in condition. He assured the public that if elected he would take over the railroad if it were not run properly, as well as the lands and the assets of the Company, but to-day we hear

nothing of this and we know when he made those statements he had no intention of carying them out. He also knew that those statements with regard to the Reid Newfoundland Company were false, but it served the purpose he had in mind in deceiving the people as to his real attitude, and he now turns a complete somersault in dealing with this Company. We are also told that out of the Surplus of three or four million dollars which was acqured by the late Government, only $400,000 of this Surplus now reman. I will again refer to this matter to-morrow .

MR. BENNETT—Mr. Chairman, the figures that were given us by the Minister of Finance as to the expenditure of the surplus require some explanation. The time does not permit to-night to diiagnose them. Ducks and drakes have been made of the surplus to the tune of $2,000,000.00 I think, it is important that during the last two or three days we have been callled upon to pass bills of far-reaching effect under suspended rules. It is a very unfair position in which to put this side of the House. We are given no time in which to consider these matters. On Thursday we had Dr. Barnes introduce a Bill of the greatest importance. It is somewhat revolutionary in its character. The addition of so many officials with increased expenses might have been criticized much more fully from this side of the House.

It is a pity that the Government ever touched the sugar situation. All that bugaboo about a shortage of sugar was mere profiteer propaganda.

This railroad Bill should have been brought in earlier in the session, but I am sure the Opposition will be glad to facilitate the Government in any way possible at this late stage of the session. A million dollars is only a drop in the bucket. The Prime Minister pointed out this afternoon that it would take $300,000 to put fish-plates on the road from here to Port-aux-Basques. Strong words of condemnation have come from the lips of the Prime Minister regarding the present management of the railroad, and I know that this money is voted against his better judgment. The Government was not unanimous in the matter, and pressure was evidently brought to bear to get him to bring in this legislation. We cannot afford to trifle with this railroad legislation. It is a matter that affects every man and woman in the country.

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.

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

Mr. Walsh gave notice of Question.

The House then adjourned accordingly.

SATURDAY, July 10th, 1920.

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

Mr. Sinnott gave notice of Question.

The Chairman from the Committee of the Whole on Supply reported certain Resolutions which were read a first time as follows:

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—As some of the largest items in Additional Estimates appertaining to the Department of Militia, and other items come within my own personal knowledge, I shall, with the permission of

the Minister of Finance and Customs make brief reference to the various items listed. The first is a vote of $250,000 for the Department of Militia, that is the estimated cost of the Department from the first of July, 1920, to the 30th day of June, 1921. Up to the present the entire cost of the Militia Department and all matters appertaining to soldiers and sailors have been paid out of Loan Account with the exception of the sum of $400,000 appropriated by the present Government out of Surplus Trust Account, which $400,000, together with $150,000 voted for Supplemental Supply covers disbursements to the 30th day of June of this year. This sum of $150,000 includes augmentation of pay, Separation Allowances, Military Hospital Commission. It does not include pensions, as that has already been voted in the Estimates, the amount for pensions being slightly over half a million dollars. The next item is the sum of $100,000 for additional pensions for soldiers. In my Manifesto issued last October I pointed out that there were some material distinctions between the Canadian scale of pensions and other allowances for soldiers and sailors and the Newfoundland scale and understood that the Canadian pension scale as it then was would be applied to Newfoundland. The question then arose as to whether the application of the Canadian scale would or would not be beneficial to Newfoundlanders and their dependents. There was some difference of opinion, and I understand there still is some difference of opinion, but the G. W. V. A. sha animously, decided to support the application of the Canadian pension scale. At a meeting between the Executive Government and a representative deputation of the Great War Veterans' Association the deputation stated that in some cases the application of the Canadian scale would undoubtedly reduce pensions, but the reductions would not bring about any hardship while the application of the Canadian scale would have the effect of giving increased pensions to specially deserving cases. The Great War Veterans' Association is thus fully conversant with the facts. There appeared to be some difference of opinion as to whether on the whole an application of the Canadian scale to Newfoundland would cost the Newfoundland Government more or less than the Newfoundland scale as at present. Some are of the opinion that the medical examination and appraisals of property and income are very much more stringent under the Canadian scale than under the Newfoundland scale. Others are of the opinion that the medical examination and appraisals in Canada are not so severe as in Newfoundland. As a result of a recent conference between the Executive Administration and representatives of the Great War Veterans' Association it was decided to give for the calendar year of 1920 a bonus of twenty per cent in cases of soldiers and sailors total disability to the dependents of deceased or totally disabled soldiers and sailors, that bonus to come into effect from the first of January, 1920. It will be remembered that in consequence there was taken in Supplemental Supply a vote of $50,000 for Additional Pensions. $50,000 is estimated to be more than sufficient to cover the bonus of twenty per cent in these cases from the first of January to the 30th of June, and by some it is estimated to be more than sufficient to cover the total increases which are likely to result from an application of the entire Canadian scale from that date if the Government decide to apply the Canadian scale in toto. The twenty per cent increase is not a permanent increase. It is an increase for the year just as it is in Canada and is

based upon the increased cost of living, the percentage to be given, if any, will be graded every year. That is, if the cost of living has materially decreased by January, 1921, there would for the same reason that this increase of twenty per cent has been given, be a reduction in the percentage, and if it is found that the cost of living has increased, increases should be according to the same principle given. The vote in the Additional Estimates for $100,000 is estimated to be more than sufficient to cover the increases to the extent of twenty per cent for the entire fiscal year, and by many it is estimated as more than sufficient to cover the entire increases which would probably result from the application of the Canadian scale as a whole. I am not myself in a position to express any opinion on that point as the opinions expressed to me are very conflicting and I have had no opportunity of making myself personally acquainted with the facts.

The next item is a vote of $73,000 under the head of Civil Re-establishment. Up to the 30th day of June the Civil Re-establishment has been conducted presumably subject to the Department of Militia, and has been paid out of Capital Account. The work of the Civil Re-establishment Committee has been very considerable and the entire country owes a deep debt of gratitude to the Civil Re-establishment Committee under the able chairmanship of Mr. Justice Kent for their abundant labor of love on behalf of the soldiers and their dependents. This committee has worked for years, has given much time, thought and valuable effort to the matter of Civil Re-establishment, Vocational training, finding of employment for soldiers and sailors. Their work has been entirely without remuneration or reward, with the exception of the salary of $1,600 which has been paid to the Vocational Officer, and that salary is not regarded as a payment to him for his services, but rather as a sum of money which would enable him to pay for the performance by others of that portion of his duties as Church of England Superintendent of Education and Civil Re-establishment work, he is unable to perform. Certainly the officials of the Department are drawing a salary, and some of the members of the Civil Re-establishment Committee occupy military and other public offices, but many of the members of the committee are giving their time and attention to the work without any thought of financial reward whatever therefor even in the most indirect manner. Some months ago when the Executive Administration was looking into this matter of Civil Re-establishment it was found that the committee was working with an absolutely free hand, without estimates, and without apparent responsibility to anybody, the moneys being paid by the Department of Militia and borne by Capital Account, the large disbursements made in connection therewith not coming to the attention of Council. In view of the very large expenditure involved, representing to date substantially over a quarter of a million dollars, the Government felt that the Civil Re-establishment Committee should for its expenditures be directly responsible to Council. In connection with the conference between the Executive Administration and the Civil Re-establishment Committee estimates were submitted as to their requirements for the coming year. These estimates were as follows: $42,000 for the three months of July, August and September; $21,000 for the three months October, November and December ;and $10,000 for the following six months to the 30th day of June, 1921, and this total of $73,000 is the vote concerning which I am now addressing the committee. Thus from

the first day of July the Civil Re-establishment Committee stands upon the basis of a philanthropic unpaid committee which holds itself responsible for this important work of Civil Re-establishment, their disbursements being limited by the Estimates as just stated. They will have full discretionary powers in connection with the handling of matters within their jurisdiction up to the expenditure of these various sums. The Civil Re-establishment Committee were of the opinion that their services might be dispensed with by the month of November or December next, possibly as early as October, but I hope that the Committee will remain in existance and continue the conduct of the work until the end of December, by which time the Committee themselves feel that the work will be so reduced that it may be satisfactorily handled by such of the officials of the Department of Militia as may be in charge of the winding up of the Department.

The vote of $55,000 for Customs Examining Warehouse is a matter which I am sure will meet with the unanimous approval of this Chamber. For many years this has been an outstanding necessity. The late Administration made provisional arrangements for the construction of a new warehouse, and this is the vote which is to carry on that most necessary undertaking.

The next is a vote of $50,000 for Postal Telegraph building. That is an undertaking the immediate public necessity of which is known to everybody. The total expense is estimated at $100,000, of which a vote for $50,000 is now taken. A very large portion of the delays, irregularities, inaccuracies and annoyances in connection with the Postal Telegraph system are due to the inefficient accommodation both for the telegraph operators and the public in its present quarters.

A vote for $1,600 for additional inspector under the Education Act is necessitated by the increase by this House of the number of inspectors from ten to eleven. The Education Act as passed provided for eleven; the education estimates provided for ten, and this vote provides for the eleventh.

The next two items are the additional amounts payable to the stenographers of the Council of Higher Education and the Registrar of the Council of Higher Education. These two amounts were omitted from the Estimates prepared for the Education Act.

The next is a vote of $50,000 for the Long Bridge. Many years ago the bridge was destroyed and a temporary bridge was made, it being the intention to put up a permanent steel structure. That temporary bridge has given service for years, and is now in such a dilapidated condition that a new bridge must be erected, and the intention is to put a permanent steel structure there. The bridge must be of sufficient strength to carry the large water main which after the construction of the bridge will be used to carry the supply of water across the river to the Southside. The road leading from Water Street to the Southside will be paved. We are all acquainted with the congested conditions of traffic. The bridge and roads leading thereto on either side will consequently be widened. The pavement will bring the surface permanently level with the railroad crossings, and the present abominantly muddy and rutty condition of that section of the town over which there is such large amount of truck, carriage and foot traffic will be improved. This matter has been inquired into from an engineering standpoint by the Government Engineer and the City Engineer, and it is hoped that it will be possible to complete the work for $50,000.

The next item is Steam Subsidies of $85,000. This is a vote for additional moneys which in all justice must be paid to certain steamers undertaking the carrying of mails. The present subsidies are based upon figures of many years ago. The services of these steamers cannot possibly be expected at these figures under existing conditions. If the committee desires any details in connection with this matter they will be given them by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

There is a vote of $100,000 for Harbor Improvements and $100,000 for Public Works. Harbor improvements cover such important undertakings as pier at Grand Bank and other matters of public importance. $100,000 for public works cover allocations for roads, bridges and other items requiring immediate attention. The vote of $25,000 for roads includes the $10,000 already provided for by statute as a vote to the Road Commission created by Act of the present session of the Legislature. $25,000 for telegraph and telephone extension will not be regarded as a large vote, but the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs estimates that very many items of most pressing importance may be accomplished within the limits of that vote.

The next three items, that of the upkeep of the new Fog Alarm Station at Lamaline, the St. Lawrence Fog Alarm Station, the Lamaline Fog Alarm, are matters of special marine importance. The item entered as "Chance Brothers order for Marine and Fisheries" is given in detail in the agenda attached to the Estimates as tabled and includes a number of acetylene lights. The vote of $3,000 for oil tanks for lighthouses is in accordance with the policy of the Administration to provide efficient and economical service. The method of supplying oil to lighthouses and the storage of oil at lighthouses has been rightly the subject of very great criticism. The waste of kerosene and gasolene has been enormous. The Government feels that by taking a vote of $3,500 now and at a subsequent session of the Legislature supplementing that vote tanks may be provided for all lighthouses requiring them and satisfaction in use and economy in fuel be secured. This it is estimated will more than repay the capital invested.

The vote of $250.00 for Child Welfare arises out of an arrangement recently entered into between myself on behalf of the Government and the ladies of the Women's Patriotic Association. As is well known, the ladies of the W.P.A. have since the War been identifying themselves with patriotic work of a very practical nature. The Child Welfare movement is due almost entirely to their enthusiastic activities. The first step taken in this connection was taken by the Morris National Administration, of which I was Colonial Secretary, an arrangement being then made in which the Government intended to give a vote of $450.00 towards Child Welfare. That vote was given for the year during a portion of which I was Colonial Secretary, but was not included in the Estimates for the following year and consequently dropped. After I assumed office in November last I was waited on in connection with the matter, with the result that the $450.00 overdue was provided for and the vote increased from $450.00 to $750.00. About a month ago I was in touch with the Women's Patriotic Association and suggested that the Public Health Officer should be given a budget of $4,000 for expenditure in connection with Child Welfare work. For some years Mayor Gosling has, I am informed, been donating his salary as Mayor to this work, and the City Council were considering taking up the matter and making a donation. My

proposition was that if the City Council donated $1,000 and the Women's Patriotic Association $2,000, the Government grant would be raised to $1,000. I understand that that proposition has been acceded to; hence the sum of $250.00 which was placed in Supplemental Supply covering the sum which would be paid for the present year and now this sum of $250.00 in the Additional Estimates would cover the amount for the 1920-21 fiscal year.

The said Resolutions being read a second time it was moved and seconded that the House concur with the Committee therein and the said Resolutions were agreed to.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. Minister of Justice the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to amend and Consolidate the Laws in relation to the Municipal Affairs of the Town of St. John's."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend and Consolidate the Laws in relation to the Municipal Affairs of the Town of St. John's" was read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that it be engrossed being entitled as above and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message requesting the concurrence of that body in its provisions.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a mesage from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Newfoundland Patriotic Fund Act, 1915" in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Newfoundland Patriotic Fund Act, 1915" was introduced and read a first time and ordered to be read a second time presently.

Whereupon the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Newfoundland Patriotic Fund Act, 1915" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Newfoundland Patriotic Fund Act, 1915."

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

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

Whereupon, the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Newfoundland Patriotic Fund Act, 1915" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that a mesage be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the said Bill had been passed without amendment.

Pursuant to order and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

The Chairman from the Committee reported that they had considered the matter to them referred, had passed certain Resolutions and asked leave to sit again.

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

Pursuant to notice and leave granted and on motion of Hon. the Minister of Finance and Customs the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider certain resolutions respecting a loan for Railway Improvmnt and Coal Development.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the Chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

HON. MINISTER FINANCE AND CUSTOMS:—Mr. Speaker, as one who sat on the Council Board, and one who fully realises the work done by Mayor Gosling, I want to endorse the remarks made by the Hon. the Prime Minister, and also to endorse the remarks made by Mr. Higgins, with regard to the Citizens' Committee. My intention in getting up is to explan to the House that the present draft of the City Charter is not completed, and I have given a personal guarantee to the Citizens' Committee that one or two of their recommendations, to be embodied in this Bill, will be brought down next session. I just wanted to prepare the House and to tell them that it is not finally settled.

MR. WALSH:—I beg to suggest what I think would be beneficial to the districts. I take it that there are too many ports for the Argyle to serve. She is not large enough. Have Marystown as terminus for Eastern ports, then the Argyle could be the link with another steamer for the inner portion of the Bay. The assistance of another steamer is necessary to have the coastal service there run properly. As to the Cape Shore of both bays, I think the placing there of a small boat would please the people. One terminus could be at Trepassey where there is railway connection and the other could be at Placentia where there is also a railway connection. This would make a suitable link between Trepassey and Placentia. Now, in reference to the purchase by the Government of two or three steamers, I have heard that one of these is to be sold to a company. May I ask the Minister if it is a local company?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Yes, it is a local company which has been incorporated.

MR. WALSH:—I anticipate that this company will put this ship on the coastal service, and I hope the Government intends to put these two other ships in the service of some part of the Island. If you have three additional steamers consideration ought to be given to this very important belt of coast line between Trepassey and Placentia. There is no coastal connection between these places at the present time. The Minister suggested that during the winter months the services of these ships would not be required and then the Trepassey and Placentia route could be given attention to, but the services of these ships are required before the winter months set it. The people there require coastal facilities for marketing their produce. They have no railway connection. Some time ago the people along there from Branch lost heavily by their inability to market their fish. They had to bring it down here in the Spring and sell it a loss of five dollars per quintal. I merely point this out to show

the justice of the statement as regards these people. I am glad to hear the Government is recognizing the just claim of these people and they have been recognizing it for some time. It was impossible for the Government of which I was a member to do anything in this matter, because during the years of the War it would be impracticable, and the people did not press their claim, but now the War is over and this is a new Government with a large surplus left it by the late Government which is being distributed lavishly and there is practically only half a million of it left. And I hope that the District of Placentia and St. Mary's will be given due consideration, because it is their right. And the people of that Dstrict have given their proportionate part towards that surplus; they have paid dollar for dollar with the men of Bonavista Bay and Twillingate and Burin and every other part of the Island, and there is no reason why the district of Placentia and St. Mary's cannot get one hundred per cent of their just claim. I do not anticipate their not being given it. All I would ask from the present Minister who has to a great extent a lot to say in the matters referred to, namely, fog alarms, light houses and general coastal facilities, that before the closing of the House if it is possible, to grant a conference with the representatives of the district. It would only require fifteen minutes for my colleagues and myself to place before the Minister what is necessary to satisfy the claim of the people of that district. They are reasonable people and no unreasonable requests have come from that district to this House during the years I had the honor to represent it and the people there have been broad-minded and big-hearted enough to endorse any request from any other part of the Island that was reasonable. And I take it it is only the wish of the Minister to meet the representatives of the District so that we may get a fair show. I do not think the Minister is the man who would turn down a just claim because of the fact that the district did not return three Liberal Reform standard bearers. If the Minister expects to have his photograph hung on the walls of the homes of these people he ought to show them sympathy when he is in a position to do so and he is well able to look after their interests in this House if he would exert himself a little.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Before the Committee rises I would like to explain that item for one hundred thousand dollars. This amount is for Normal School expenditure. Instead of being in the Additional Estimates it should be charged on Capital Account and then debited Surplus Account. I omitted to refer to this while it was before the House.

MR. HIGGINS:—I wish to say just one word for the purpose of commenting upon the remarks of the present Government that the past Government were characterized by their spending habits, but I think the blame was wrongly directed, as the present Government is starting out with the substantial Additional Estimates covering one million dollars. But as regards the third period of the year which has to come, I venture to prophesy that the expectations of the Government will not be realized and I think this celebrated expenditure in the form of Additional Estimates will thoroughly satisfy them that the late Government was not so lavish after all. The Government is starting out well in the matter of figures.

Mr. Higgins asked the Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if

Patrick O'Toole, late Lighthouse Keeper at Pack's Harbor, has been dismissed; if so, for what reason, and to lay on the table of the House copies of any correspondence which may contain a complaint against the said official.

HON. MINISTER MARINE AND FISHERIES:—Patrick O'Toole was dismissed on the request of some of the members of Conception Bay.

MR. HIGGINS:—OF which district?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—You can include them all. The request was made by the people of Bay Roberts, the members for Harbor Grace and other members in Conception Bay. You can include them all. I might tell the hon. member that there have been several dismissals from Light House positions on the Labrador Coast. We intend to have the present lights replaced by acetylene lights and then there will be no need for the present keepers. The men who are doing the work are only temporary.

MR. HIGGINS:—But may I ask the Minister to explain this? Since the Speaker shakes his head , he must have been dismissed by the Hon. Dr. Barnes, Mr. Archibald and Captain Gosse. But Dr. Barnes shakes his head and Mr. Archibald says "No" and I think it is unfair to blame Capt. Gosse when he is absent from the House. Surely there must have been a reason over and above the mere fact that this man was requested by some one or some persons to be dismissed. O'Toole lives in Harbor Grace and has no position in God's world. Then why was he dismissed and by whom?Surely that is a reasonable request. I am sure the members of the F.P.U. did not recommend his dismissal. I am sure it was not because of the color of his tie. Now the Minister knows that what he has said does not represent the real story. Why not tell us right out why the man was dismissed? As to the further part of the question I ask that it be laid on the table of the House.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—I have given the hon. member the best explanation I could. If he wants to fully discuss the matter, well, I am satisfied to go on and discuss it. It was not because of the color of his tie.

MR. HIGGINS:—I take the answer of the Minister to be this: Because some one recommended his dismissal he was dismissed. You know there must be some cause why it was done more than a mere request to do so. The Minister well knows he will not dismiss any Civil Service employee because he is asked to dismiss him. This is not in the line of the conduct of the man. What has happened? Does the Minister decline to answer?

HON MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—Does the hon. member take the position that because a half dozen are dismissed there is no reason. I suppose the reason is political.

MR. HIGGINS:—Well, politics forms the reason why he is dismissed. I suppose the only construction that can be placed on it is that he did not vote right in Hr. Main and was dismissed from public service. But after all I must state that if the Minister dismissed him for political reasons the information which was conveyed to him must have been false, because he is going to re-appoint him in a position of a Warden. Is it not correct that his salary as light-house keeper is to be doubled as a Warden?

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—His present position as Warden will carry the same amount as he got as Light-House Keeper.

MR. HIGGINS:—If you are going to give this man only quarter of the salary he got as light-house keeper you have done far worse because the information which coused his dismissal was false, but I feel confident that the Minister will re-adjust his salary and all I want to get is an undertaking that this man will get decent treatment.

HON. MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—He will get the same salary that he got as light-house keeper. As was done by the late Government, he will be paid by two or three departments. He will receive some from the Game Board and some from the Fishery Board.

Mr. Walsh asked the Minister of Finance and Customs to lay on the table of the House a statement—

(a) Showing all payments made to R. T. McGrath, Inspector of Customs for the past two years, ending June 30th for travelling expenses;

(b) Copy of all vouchers for said payments.

HON. MINISTER OF FINANCE:—In answer to this question I may say I have received the information asked for. Last night in debating I made a statement to the Leader of the Opposition to which he took exception. I stated that there were no vouchers returned for the amount advanced this gentleman for inspectorial work. I still contend that no vouchers from a business man's point of view were received. The Auditor General accepted them and stamped them, but for a long time he took exception to them, saying they were not vouchers. I have much pleasure in presenting these bills, but I still contend that no vouchers, from a business man's point of view, were received.

Mr. Walsh asked the Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to lay on the table of the House a statement showing

(a) The amount of money paid E. G. Stone of Catalina for services in connection with the department of Marine and Fisheries from July 15th, 1917, to November 15th, 1919;

(b) Class of work performed and time employed.

HON MINISTER OF MARINE AND FISHERIES:—In reply to the hon. member for Placentia and St. Mary's I have to say that I only saw the question now, and I will take the matter up and give the information in a day or two.

SIR MICHAEL CASHIN:—Before the passing of these Resolutions, I wish to make one or two observations. I am glad that the railway policy of the Government has been presented to the House at last. We were waiting for ten weeks to be informed what the Government intended to do with reference to the railway, or what their attitude would have been towards the Reid Newfoundland Company. We know, and the people know, that considerable discussion with regard to this matter had taken place in the public press last September and up to January, with regard to the railroad. Considerable blame was laid upon the late Government because of their action towards the railway management. During the six months just passed, the new Government made it their platform and policy to criticise us for our action in regard to the reconstruction and repairs of the Reid Newfoundland Railway, saying that we failed to keep the contractors up to their contractual obligations. The present Government made this their platform on going to the electorate. Both on the platform and in the public press it was presented to the peo-

ple of this country by the present Government that we had been wanting in our interest to the people in our failure to compel the Reid Newfoundland Company to put the railroad in that condition of repair, which it evidently called for, and the members now on the Government side said in effect: "if you will return us to the House of Assembly we will look after the railroad and put it in good condition." Everything that happened on the railroad for the past number of years in the way of accidents or disarrangement was charged to the late Govt. After all that has been said in that direction, we expected something in a business way from the Government of the day. The disinterested outsider who has read the statements of the public press for the past few months has been looking for a report of the proceedings of the House, to see what is doing or what is going to be done by the present Government, and up to this point in the session no pronouncement had been made; but yesterday, on the eve of the closing of the House and under suspended rules, the Finance Minister —or pardon me, the Prime Minister —brings down a half-hearted proposition to this House and this country in reference to the Railroad. The Prime Minister made a statement here yesterday with reference to the Reid Newfoundland Company wherein he pointed out what the Government intended to do in that direction.

MR. SULLIVAN:—Mr. Chairman, as I have already remarked, I found that when I last began there were no reporters in the box. I presume that there must be some good reason for their abence. However, as the supervisor has kindly consented to transcribe my few remarks, I shall now proceed with the question before the Chair. In dealing with the Resolutions before the House, I propose to deal with them in a spirit of constructive criticism, because I deem it a duty which I owe to my constituents to place myself on record as being in favor of the Resolutions in so far as they go towards placing the Railway on a workable basis. I wish to take this opportunity of congratulating the Prime Minister on his evident conversion to the principles of Reidism. I feel sure that there is joy among the directorate of the Reid Newfoundland Company over the return of the prodigal Squires back to the fold in which he used to wander from 1908 to 1919. I will now quote a paragraph from the "Daily Star." (Mr. Sullivan quotes from the "Daily Star.")

That being so why are we votnig them one million dollars? I think the idea that the road will be put in repair by putting on new fish plates is a ridiculous one. That is only one provision. No provision has been has been made for raising the road bed, new ties, renewing rails, reducing curves, and numerous other things that must be done before the road can be operated successfully. I venture to predict, that with the same conditions next Winter that we had to face last Winter, that the position will be worse with regard to tie ups. I can understand the Premier coming in and asking for one million dollars for road repairing, but when it comes to putting seven hundred thousand for terminals and rolling stock, and only three hundred thousand for road work, it is bordering on twenty years behind the times, and if the Reids cannot run it it is up to the Government to see that it is run, and properly run. I have just returned from a trip to Canada and I came across on the Kyle, and I want to say here now that the accomodation on that steamer was not nearly sufficient

for the number of people travelling on her. It is essential that there should be another boat put on that route to accomodate the people who are travelling.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Chairman, now that we have arrived at a period when we got to get sensibly to work to devise the best way that the railway has got to be kept up and properly kept up, the money has to be provided to keep it up. It is like a poor tenant who has got a house but is unable to keep it in repair. The landlord for the sake of his own property comes in and they make a joint deal to help the thing along. The same applies to the railway and the Government. In the opening days of the session when the Address in Reply was under debate I made a commentary and I have only to repeat it now that it is only necessary for hon. members to remember the conditions under which we built the railway to be forced to the conclusion that it is nonsensical to expect that the railway can be kept up properly under present day conditions. We built a cheap railway many years ago under conditions that were never contemplated at that time would have to compete with our present day methods, and in the years that have passed we have found ourselves, through stress of traffic, compelled to admit that the farcical notion of talking of keeping the Reids up to their contract only meant the going back to those conditions of twenty years ago. I think I have stated dozens of times that the railway, when it was built, was never intended for a carrying railway at all, and it was never contemplated that it would be called upon to do the heavy work that it is called upon to do now. The proposition is peculiar to me as one who was familiar with the operations of the railroad and as one who has been paid for studying the railway contract; but I can say this that the Government of the day have acted wisely when they took the advice of the Attorney General and when they took the liability they were saddling the Reid Company with, and I have to say this that the thing that always struck me forcibly was that if the Company took the alternative and said "There is the outfit, run it yourselves," the whole thing would be on our hands. We would regret the day when such a course as this would be taken. As I pointed out on the opening day of this session, if you advertise this railway to-day all over the world no reputable concern would touch it, unless you have a substantial cheque to offer in advance. It can never pay as a railway and the reasons are obvious. A railway can only pay with short hauls and no long haul in the handling of freights. This Company always have long hauls, and until such time as you develop a sort of inter-town traffic like they have at Grand Falls and with special rates for short hauls on freight, you are not going to make it pay. And that day is not in the immediate future. It may come, but it will never come in a hurry. To-day a shipment of flour is dropptd off a steamer at Port aux Baques, the terminus of the railroad, put on board a train and is carried all the way to Humbermouth, a distance of hundreds of miles, before it is landed, whereas if this freight was dropped off somewhere en route and some other freight substituted, it would be an entirely different matter. The other situation that we must bear in mind when dealing with this problem so far as the earning power of trains are concerned, is that we are in the unfortunate position that whatever is voted now can only

be termed a temporary cure until such time as the guage of the road is altered. With our present guage an engine and train crew can only haul one-half the freight that they can haul in Canada and for the same amount of expense; in other words a train here will generally take six car loads of freight to one haul, whereas in Canada a train will take twelve, this in view of the fact that wages and other expenses are equal, so that you absolutely cannot have a railway pay in this country without making some very marked changes, and it is just as well for us to look at it in that way. That being so, the proper course, I think, for us to take in the way of a business proposition is this. Say to the Reid Company, you are operating this railway and we are prepared to help it out, but in return bear in mind that you got certain lands and water powers and certain natural resources and which are greatly enhanced by the carrying on of the railway. And I say here now that the Reid people themselves ought help the Government and the Colony in the operation of the railway for their own sakes, because the development of those timber lands that they have largely depends upon having the railway run as methodically as possible. It is clearly our duty to the country to see that the railway is kept up and that is why I support the measure now before the Chair.

The great point lost sight of by some people with regard to the operation of the railway is that they have lived in a fool's paradise, inasmuch as they have been under the impression that the railway was supposed to be kept up in accordance with the nature of traffic and that if it was not kept up—I regret that the Prime Minister is not in his seat in the House to argue that point—that we would turn around and come down on the Reid Company. Any person who has read the contract knows that the Reids to-morrow have their penalty for them in the contract. One thing we should bear in mind, now that the elections are over and the Prime Minister having used his election kite to his advantage on this issue is that this business has got to be tackled properly to put the railway in shape, altho as I have said already, whatever we do now will be only a temporary cure. My idea for saying this is not the idea given me by the Reid Company's statement, nor is it my own idea nor the idea given me by train men with whom I have had close intercourse, but it is the idea of the Government Engineer, whose report on the railway I have now before me. The great trouble to-day is that we got a rail too light, a rail that is too light even if laid down new today, despite the fact that it has done twenty years' service, and it is too light for the class of engine on it. The actual fact is that I am voting to-night for something that I know is merely a bagatelle to what has got to follow in the years to come. I am absolutely satisfied to-day that the putting of heavier fish-plates in operation is no more going to remedy all the things we are complaining of than it is possible for me financially to go to work and build a railway. Take the report of the Government Engineer, as tabled in this House. Here is what he says in part:

(Mr. Higgins reads extract from report.)

The specification upon which that road bed was constructed was poor and cheap just the same as a man who wants a cheap concreting job done and the specification was in accordance with price paid. On that point hon. members opposite, no doubt, will observe that the track

bends as a train passes over it and is not sufficiently substantial to put fish-plates on. It is just as well for us to understand that. Still we are begnning again to do a cheap job with this vote. We certainly are not going to cure the trouble; we will only relieve it for the time being. The fastenings are weak both as to the weight of the material and bolts themselves. Following a special report made by the Government Engineer after the unfortunate accident caused by a derailment and into which an enquiry was held last year, I remember specifically the point developed, and Judge Morris, the presiding gexamining officer, asked the Government Engineer what was necessary in the interest of public safety and efficient operation of the road, and the answer was the heavy rail. In my judgment it is an unfortunate state of affairs and a great pity that the Government has not gone to that extent and tried to remedy matters, but I think that it has got to come and is bound to come. I must say that, on behalf of the Colony, we must see that this money is to be properly ear-marked and properly spent, but we must remember that when embarking on that enterprise that the day is over for talking about the liability of the Reids concerning the railroad; because once you take the position that we are taking here to-night, and in the light of the statements of the Prime Minister and the recommendations of the Government Engineer, under the circumstances, it is just as well to make up our minds that we are started on the first step of relieveing Reids of any liability. There is no mistake about that point. Once we vote for these Resolutions we are decidedly putting the Reid Company in the position to be excused from any liability in the years to come. I have my own opinion on what is going to happen the expenditure of this one million dollars. What will be found to happen and what is bound to happen and what must of necessity happen, as already pointed out by Mr. Sullivan, that apart altogehter from this defect of light rail, there is the further and serious defect of the narrow road-bed. I do not know who developed it, but certainly it is a well recognized and accepted theory in the practical experience of railroad men, that in winter snow fighting is entirely due to the narrowness of the road-bed and the unfitness of the bolts. Now what is the use of getting on fish-plates and getting additional rolling stock and terminals, etc., if it is not going to affect the bolts and improve the road-bed, and that trouble is going to continue until such time as these people who are operatnig the road are able to cope with it. It is unfortunate that the Government should have taken the attitude they have to this matter in the interests of the Colony, but the Government must remember that henceforth they will be responsible to the people, and responsible to this extent, that once they appoint a commission to deal with the railroad question they have to be prepared to bear the blame for all complaints and trouble that arise.

Regarding the position of lack of freight accomodation at St. John's, I do not think that there can be any doubt at all on that point. This reminds me of the frightful conditions for handling freight at Port aux Basques and I hope that the Government will not lose sight of this fact, as I believe that the situation there is more important than at St. John's because Port aux Basques accounts for about two-thirds of the freight that offers to come here. The

real great trouble in the tie-up of freight there is caused by the abominable conditions at North Sydney, where they have poor facilities for transhipment; and I hope that one of the results that will be derived in the spending of this money will be the improvements of condition at Port aux Basques and North Sydney. Something was done in that connection last year, but it all fell short of what was required.

There is just one point more I would like to emphasize here and that is that so far as these Resolutons are concerned they were never discussed by the Oppositnon as a Party, but I feel confident that our viewpoint must be the same in voting on this measure, because we recognize that there are two courses open, namely, to take over the railway altogether ,or help carry it along as well as we can for the present. The last course is the best seeing that we are faced with the situation that we got, because, after all, the organization that is running the railway is the best we can get anyhow, and with experienced railroad men in it, the best that can be found in the country. I think, therefore, that we should support the Government in this programme; it is the eternal fitness of things that those of us on this side of the House who have been so much accused of enlarging the powers of that Company should be present to-night and be able to say Amen to those on the other side who sang their hymns of faith and who filled their newspapers about all the dire things they were going to do with the Reids, and the only personal satisfaction they have got is that they have voted to the Reids this one million dollars.

On the matter of coal development I will not attempt to say more than this: If the Government have decided to invest money in this proposition, I feel sure that it will only be done upon a satsfactory report, because all of us wish well to the St. George's Coal Fields Co. However we must not be unmindful of the fact that nothing is more deceptive and nothing requires a more careful report than a report upon a coal formation of that character, and I think that the Government have acted wisely in arranging for an independent report. I am sure nobody doubts for a moment the ability and competency of those two experts, Messrs. Hatch and Forbes, but I think that the report ought to be checked off by some outside independent and thoroughly competent person who has not been in that area. We all look to these coal areas with natural pride and we will be all glad to know that the Government intends to develop and put to practical use this coal. Even if we can get this coal at the same figure as we get it from the outside, I think that it will be a great thing for this country and for the people in the country. I saw samples of this coal and can testify as to the excellence of the quality of it. I do trust that the report to the Government will warrant them making that proposed expenditure.

I say in all sincerity that nothing, so far as St. John's is concerned, will give greater satisfaction than the voting of money that will result in the developing of our own coal resources. Now I just want to say another word, Mr. Chairman. A good deal has been said with regard to the handling of these Companies on Bell Island, and much and all as harsh treatment of these people might affect me politically, and pleasant and all as our relations may have been in the past, I think, nevertheless, that it is time

that the Government should put its pads on and get busy to bring about some sort of understanding that will be of advantage on and get busy to bring about some sort of understanding that will be at to us, and I do think that the Government should not be over lavish in kindness when dealing with these people in the future, in the light of how they have treated us. In view of all the circumstances, I think they should have done better. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I propose to vote for the resolutions before the Chair, not in the spirit in which they were introduced, not in the spirit of camouflaging the point at issue, but in the spirit that we should do the very best that we can as regards our legal obligations and as regards our obligations to the people whom we represent.

MR. WALSH:—Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to say that I fully endorse the statements of the hon. member for St. John's East when he said that the Opposition held no party meeting on this matter. I had no idea what the attitude of the members of the Opposition was with regard to the measure before the Chair until I heard them express their views here this evening. With regard to my personal relations with the company under discussion, I can say that I never had the slightest transaction with the Reid Newfoundland Company and never intend to while I am a member of this Legislature, because I realize that only when one is under no obligation to that Company, and only when one is absolutely clear of all relation with them that he can do justice to the constituency that he may have the honor to represent in this House. With regard to the statements of the Prime Minister, I regret that he found it necessary to make the attack upon the Reid Newfoundland Company which characterized his introduction of the measure. If he made that attack because the heads of that Company happened to be his opponents in the recent election, I can only say that such action on his part was beneath the dignity of the office he holds, and I might add that in the same election some of my own bitterest opponents were officials of that same Company. However, all that is now over, and no such considerations should be permitted to effect our deliberations in the enactment of such legislation as is now before us. Altho this is the most important business that has yet come before us it has been held back to the dying hours of the session and members are given no opportunity to deal with it in the manner which its importance calls for. For instance, here is the report of the Government Engineer, teeming, I am sure, with information that would be of the greatest value in the consideration of this matter, which we never had a chance to discuss and which should have been placed on the desks of hon. members as should every other bit of information of the kind which we have had to demand of the Government this session. I doubt if the private members of the Government have seen this report or are aware of its contents. I want to say at the outset, Mr. Chairman, that it is both my intention and my duty to suport these Resolutions and like the previous speakers, I want to record my regrets that the Bill does not ask for a more substantial amount to put at least the trunk line across country in better condition. No one will deny that the railway from St. John's to Port aux Basques is the main artery of the Dominion's traffic and if the statements made in this House and in certain newspapers as to the terrible

conditions under which people are travelling over that line are correct, and I have no doubt they are correct, how can one million dollars effect the desired improvement especially when not all that sum is to be used in reconstruction. As a matter of fact, only $300,000 is to be used for the reconstruction of five hundred miles of railway, and any common-sense practical man knows that this amount is not enough to do more that improve the fish-plates. I submit, Sir, that this is not what we should be doing. We should be tackling this thing in a business-like way. We have no hesi- no doubt, but this is the most import- other improvements, necessary too, tation in voting large amounts for ant of all and if the day should come when the Dominion will no longer be able to keep the railway in condition where it will be of service, that will be the day that some peatriotic Newfoundlander should put an ad in the papers "A Country For Sale." Instead of what we are doing we should be voting ten millions of dollars and making provision for a standard guage railway and further branch lines, so many of which were promised by the present Government before they came into power. During the war we were called upon to make extraordinary expenditure. $10,000,000, I think, was our war debt, and this was something for which we never hoped to get returns, while there were further losses for which no amount of millions could recompense us, the losses in blood spilled by the Country's noblest and best. We have been able to meet the interest on this amount without interference with the administration of our civil government, and we would be increasing the earning power of our people now if we were to ask for ten millions instead of one. There are men now in the States who should be working at home and who, instead of helping to build up institutions in other countries should be helping to build up their own country. Three hundred thousand dollars now is but a temporary remedy and we will be asked to vote the same amount next year. While we are asked to vote fifty thousand dollars for a terminus at Port aux Basques, there are places along the line where there is not even a shelter for passengers waiting for the train and who have walked perhaps ten or twelve miles to the railway, and there are flag stations where freight and express packages are thrown off without anybody to care what becomes of them.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I cannot agree with the proposal that a commission be appointed to look after the expenditure of this money and I certainly do not agree with the suggestion of the Prime Minister in moving these resolutions that those associated with the Reid Company know nothing about their work. The members of that Company, or some of them at least, have been closely associated with railway work since railway operations started in this country. Take Mr. Powell, for example; he is not only a prac.tical man but an experienced civil engineer and we should be glad that such a man is a Newfoundlander instead of casting reflections upon him thru the Press and in this House. Now, Sir, I want it to be understood that Mr. Powell is a man with whom I have not exchanged ten words in my life, and I speak as I do because I am not at all in keeping with the getting off of this camouflage to which we have been treated of late with regard to this matter. Perhaps if some others of the Reid family were in control things would be different.

With regard to the matter of Bell

Island, I have just a word or two to say. I quite agree with the previous speakers that this is another serious blunder on the part of the Government, but this cannot be laid at the doors of the present Government alone, but many previous Governments have been equally to blame. The steel works which were responsible for the boom in Eastern Canada and which made Sydney, should be in Conception Bay. It is notorious that the iron mines of Bell Island are the richest in the world and it is equally well known that Germany would have paid billions of dollars for them, but the only advantage that we derive from them is that some of our laborers get employment there at a lesser wage than they would get anywhere else, and now is the time for the Government to step in and see that we get fairer returns for what we give, and more especially as these people are now showing their teeth in the matter of our coal supply. I had hoped that the Government would be able to come to terms with these people even if drastic measures were necessary and if friction does come the Government can count on me.

With regard to the half million dollars for St. George's Coal Fields, this is a matter with which I have had some experience, one which I have studied carefully, and I am convinced that the late Mr. Howley, who held the position of Geologist for a number of years, is right in his prediction that St. George's Bay was destined one day to become just as rich in coal as it is at the present time. The formation of St. George's Bay is somewhat different from over across the Gulf, but still with the experience I have had, and with the knowledge derived from going through the reports of the late Mr. Howley, I am convinced that coal will be found in sufficient quantity in St. George's to pay commercially if development is undertaken by the Government or by any private company. The largest coal colliery in British North America is in Cape Breton, and I had the honor of being one of the first two men who broke coal in that colliery, and the honor of working five years in the development of that colliery, and it cost the company eight million dollars before one cent of return was realised. I have no doubt that the same coal extends to St. George's and now that the Government have taken over the place seriously that they will come to a suitable arrangement with Canada to send down a competent man to report, because after all it is the duty of the Government before it goes any furthr to see that they are not making a false step. I want to commend the Government for going outside, as they have done, and having an independent report given on behalf of the people interestd in St. George's Coal Fields, and I wish them every success, and if it can be found that there is a sufficient quantity of coal there to work commercially, it will relieve us of being under a compliment to any outside company for our coal supplies. Now, I have no desire to prolong the debate. I intend to vote for the resolutions, and I only regret that they do not go further, that they are not in keeping with what the country is expecting from the Government with regard to the reconstruction and reorganization of the railway.

MR. FOX:—Mr. Chairman, I wish to register a protest against an important measure of the like of these Resolutions being brought before this chamber at the eleventh hour. We have been in session nearly three months and a matter of such importnace as this might have been brought

down before the closing of the session, and I cannot realize for a moment why the Government realizing the necessity for introducing some such measure as this did not do so sooner. It will be remembered that right along through the session when members of the Opposition asked for information with regard to what form the Railway Bill would be likely to take, they were absolutely refused information, and now when this measure is brought before the House we have to suffer the indignity of being asked to rush the matter through this afternoon. This indignity is intensified by the attitude assumed by certain members of the Cabinet, who not alone said that they wanted this Bill put through quickly, but threatened the Opposition that if it were not put through quickly that they would withdraw it. I don't know what idea the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had in mind in making this threat, but I would like to tell him that as far as I am concerned, the threat had no effect whatever, that it is immaterial to me whether they withdraw the Resolutions or not. I think that the legislation of this country has reached a pretty pass, and I protest against the idea of asking this House to consider these Resolutions without having the necessary information handed them to enable them to consider them in an intelligent manner. We have been denied all information on the matter. When we asked to have the report of the Government Engineer tabled we were told by another Minister of the Crown, the Minister of Public Works, that it has not been usual in the past for members of the House to have access to reports of this kind. This report is of such a nature that every Government official, let alone members of the House, has a right to see it. One would think by the attitude taken by the Government in refusing any information on this matter, that a measure involving the expenditure as it does of one million dollars is of trifling importance. This is one of the most important matters ever before the country. It deals with the principal industries of the country, as it is the only means we have of shipping our products, and the Government should not have waited until the last hours of the session to bring this matter before the House. The Prime Minister yesterday afternoon officially took charge of these Resolutions, and might I ask why he is not here to-night when they are being discussed? Does anybody know? Does the Hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries know? Does the Hon. the Minister of Justice know?

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—Mr. Speaker, in moving the second reading of this Bill, I would like to explain that in 1915 an Act was passed incorporating certain Trustees of the Patriotic Association. They reported to the Government a few months ago that their work was hindered by that Act, that certain instances of need in connection with soldiers and sailors which should come within the scope of their operations, did not under the Act. The Secretary hereby requests that the following amendements go into effect.

I feel that these amendments which were suggested by the Trustees of the Newfoundland Patriotic Association will have the approval of the people and of the Legislative Council, and that they will receive an unanimous second reading.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—The Prime Minister is very busy outside finishing the Salaries Act.

MR. FOX:—In view of the importance of the Resolutions before the

Chair, the proper place for the Prime Minister is in his seat. The Prime Minister yesterday afternoon tabled certain memorials from the Reid Newfoundland Company, and we are not supplied with a copy of them, and I suppose it would be useless for us to ask for a copy.

HON. MINISTER OF JUSTICE:—There was a copy supplied to the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. FOX:—That is not sufficient. It does not follow that because the Leader of the Opposition has a copy that every member of the Opposition will have it at his disposal, and every member of the Opposition should be furnished with all data in reference to these Resolutions. It is not creditable to the Government to be so discourteous to the members of His Majesty's Opposition, as they have been right through the session. Now with regard to the report of the Government Engineer, the Hon. Minister of Public Works stated that it was not usual for members to be furnished with reports of this nature. If he has any proof to bring forward of this statement, I am prepared to listen to it.

HON. THE MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS:—The position I took was this. While I was in this House for the last four or five years that course which the hon. member says should be followed was not followed. Reports of this nature were handed to the Leader of the Opposition for perusal, but not to the members of the Opposition individually. The point I wanted to make was that the Government did not act discourteously in not acceding to the request of Mr. Fox.

MR. FOX:—I understand from the Minister that he is merely drawing upon his own personal experience for his statement, but now he will have to give me some authority for his statement to show that what he outlined is the usual procedure. The action of the Government in this respect shows that they are neglecting their public duties, that they are not alive to their responsibilities. The expenditure of one million dollars on that railway is not sufficient. Putting new fish-plates will not put that railway in a condition that will make it safe for the people of the country to travel on. We are supposed to be spending one million dollars on the road, when in reality we are only spending three hundred and fifty thousand for that purpose, and the rest for rolling stock and terminals. Three hundred and fifty thousand dollars will do nothing in the way of reconstruction. You may put in all the new rolling stock that you please, but if you do not improve the road-bed and the weight of the rail, it will all be no good. It will be only a wast of money and next Winter we will have railway conditions as bad as ever.

TUESDAY, July 13th, 1920.

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

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill entitled "An Act to provile for the Collection and Distribution of the Estates of certain Esquimaux Deceased" without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Act Sixty-one Victoria (1898) Chapter Eight entitled "An Act Respecting Salaries" without amendment.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that he had received a message from the Legislative Council acquainting the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bills entitled "An Act Respecting Certain Retiring Allowances," "An Act further to amend the Revenue Act 1905," "An Act for the Raising by Loan of a Sum of Money for Railway and other Purposes" and "An Act for Granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for Defraying Certain Expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Years ending respectively—30th day of June, 1920 and 30th day of June, 1921 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 Bills sent up entitled respectively:—"An Act to amend the Education Act"; "An Act to amend Chapter 162 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (third series) entitled "Of the Prosecution of the Seal Fishery'"; "An Act Relating to Trustee Investments"; "An Act to amend Chapter 143 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (third series) entitled 'Of the Keeping of Dogs'" and "An Act for giving effect to the Treaties of Peace between His Majesty and Certain other Powers" with some amendments in which they requested the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

AMENDMENT TO EDUCATION ACT

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—This amendment was introduced by the Legislative Council and relates to the qualifications of Supervisors. It will be remembered that the section with respect to Supervisors provided that the Supervisor had to be a teacher who had not given up the teaching profession for more than 3 years prior to appointment, the policy of the Government being that teachers in active service should have the preference. It was thought, however, that under very exceptional circumstances there might be a person specially qualified as a Supervisor who had recently given up teaching and that such a person might, though having given up the teaching profession, be specially qualified for the appointment. The Legislative Council desired to make the policy of the Government in that regard perfectly clear in the section by submitting an amendment to the effect that teachers actively engaged in the profession should have preference over teachers who had vacated the profession within the period of three years provided their qualifications were equal. This Amendment is directly in line with the policy of the Administration and has the Government endorsation. I would consequently move that this Amendment be now read a first time.

SEAL FISHERY AMENDMENT

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—These amendments have been made by the Legislative Council after conference with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and they are regarded by the Minister as improving the Bill as a Legislative enactment. I move that they be read now a first time.

TRUSTEE BILL AMENDMENT

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—This is a trifling amendment with the addition of a word or two which give an improved grammatical construction to the section and make its interpretation clearer. I consequently move that this amendment be now read a first time.

DOG BILL AMENDMENT

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—This Dog Bill introduced by Mr. Fox was the subject of very mirthful discussion in this Chamber after it had made its appearance on the Order Paper for some weeks without being considered. The Council has made an

amendment that Shepherd Dogs and Collies have to be certified as such by the Department of Agriculture and Mines. I understand that the mover of the Bill in this Chamber, Mr. Fox, concurs in the amendments. I have no objection thereto. I have heard of certified stock, certified grain and many other certified products. We are now, under this amendment, to have certified dogs. I feel that it is my duty to the honourable members of the Legislative Council who inserted this amendment and to Mr. Fox, who introduced the Bill into this Chamber, to move that the amendment be now read a first time.

PEACE TREATY AMENDMENT

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:— This Bill as it passed this Chamber related to the Treaty of Peace with Germany. The Council has enlarged the scope of this Bill so as to include Peace Treaties with all the opposing nations. The Bill is improved by this amendment. I move that it be read a first time.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the said several amendments were read a first time and ordered to be read second time presently.

Whereupon, the said several amendments were read a second time and concurred in and it was ordered that a message be sent to the Legislative Council acquainting that body that the said amendments had been agreed to without amendment.

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 Appointment of a Temporary Commission for the City of St. John's" in which they request the concurrence of the House of Assembly.

On motion of Hon. the Prime Minister the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Appointment of a Temporary Commission for the city of St. John's was read a first time and ordered to be read a second time presently.

Whereupon, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Appointment of a Temporary Commission for the City of St. John's, was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently.

Whereupon, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Appointment of a Temporary Commission for the City of St. John's.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

Mr. Hibbs took the chair of Committee.

Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair.

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

This report was received and adopted and it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time presently.

Whereupon, the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Appointment of a Temporary Commission for the city of St. John's" was read a third time and passed and it was ordered that the said Bill be engrossed being entitled as above and that it be sent to the Legislative Council with a message acquainting that body that the House of Assembly had passed the said bill without amendment.

Honourable, the Prime Minister tabled Report of the Newfoundland Patriotic Fund for the year ending Dec. 31, 1919.

Observations in reply to Mr. Fox on Muncipal Bill.

MR. HIGGINS:—Mr. Speaker, before this Municipal Bill passes I would like to say that it should not be allowed to go out of the House without a word of commendation being place on record of the work of the Citizens' Committee, of the gentlemen who gave so much time and

consideration to this Bill. The Citizens' Committe spent months in session in consideration of the draft of the Charter which has been submitted to the House, and it will be agreed with all subsequently connected with it that their criticisms were intelligent and expressive of an honest desire to make such improvements as possible with regard to the Municipal Government of St. John's. I think it is only right for me to avail of the opportunity as Secretary of the original Committee to pay tribute to Mr. Cochrane, Mr. Soper, Mr. Kelly and the Secretary, Mr. Smith, who are in the main responsible for the Bill which is now before us, and which reflects credit upon these gentlemen. Also Mr. Jonas Barter and Mr. Davey the contractors are worthy of our thanks for the manner in which they have endeavored to perfect this Bill. This Bill has caused a considerable amount of discussion for some years past, but the Bill in its present form does not make any considerable alteration in the methods of government, and I feel sure that the new council in December next will not be vested with any authority that will be objectionable to the citizens. I think it should go on record that we are not unmindful of the interest that the gentlemen I have already mentioned have shown in this Charter. I also want to say that on their behalf, I thank the House for the courtesy shown them by deferring the Bill for the past two days to give them a chance to consider it, and as I anticipated, it only required the Bill being sent to them to satisfy them that their recommendations have, in the main, been adopted.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—

Mr. Speaker, Permit me to join with my learned friend, the member for St. John's East, in an expression of appreciation to the Citizens' Committee who for so many months have worked assiduously to perfect the City Charter, and also to extend a word of sincere esteem for the efforts of Mayor Gosling who for so many years past has devoted his time to civic improvement. This Charter is the result of the combined efforts of the Mayor and Councillors and the Citizens' Committee and I feel that sincere congratulations and a high meed of praise must be extended to them for the work which they have accomplished.

HON. THE PRIME MINISTER:—

Late last evening while I was attending a meeting of Committee of Council I received a telephone message from the Legislative Council that some of the members of the Council were strenuously opposing the passage of the new Charter and that the majority of the members of the Council were not in favor of the Charter in its existing form. I consequently adjourned Council and attended the President's Room of the Legislative Council. On finding that it was quite useless to expect to secure the passage of the Bill I caused to be drafted the Bill which has just been reported as having passed the Legislative Council. This Bill provides for the appointment of a Commission to govern the affairs of the city of St. John's from January to June, 1921. It will be remembered that some weeks ago His Excellency the Governor assented to a Bill providing for a Commission for the City of St. John's from July to December of this year. That Bill was passed on the supposition that the City Charter would become law at the closing of this session of the Legislature, as it was discovered that it would be hopeless for the City Charter to pass the Legislative Council either in its present form or with such slight amendments

as could be readily considered by this Chamber. It was imperative that this Bill should be submitted so that we might have a form of Municipal Government during the first half of the year 1921. The Council made an amendment to the Bill as presented by the addition of a section which provides that no abbatoir shall be erected or operated within the city limits after the first day of January, 1921. The objections to the City Charter were many. The members of Council were unanimous in expressing their appreciation of the work of Mayor Gosling and the members of the City Council; they were unanimous in their approval of the splendid work of the Citizens' Committee, but they felt that there were many sections in the Charter which could not meet with their approval. Opinions as to the desirability of various sections diverged very widely and in some cases there was very aggressive opposition. I had personally met the members of the Legislative Council during the early part of the evening and discussed the charter with. I pointed out that the new City Council to be elected under the Charter would not take office until the first of January, 1921, that the Citizens' Committee was not entirely satisfied with the Bill and had a considerable number of amendments to suggest. The Citizens' Committee felt, however, that the Bill might be passed in its present form at this session, and at the next session of the Legislature, which would probably be in January or February of next year, the whole matter could be discussed at an early date in the session. The members of the Legislative Council felt, however, that this Bill had not been discussed in the House of Assembly, that it was accepted unanimously by the House of Assembly without debate in the closing days of the session on the informal report of a voluntary and informal committee consisting of Mayor Gosling, Messrs. Browning and Halfyard, of the Government, and Messrs. Bennett, Higgins, Vinnicombe and Fox, of the Opposition, and that while the House of Assembly had passed the Bill without debate they were not prepared to assume that responsibility and desired to discuss it in its details and at length. For some considerable time last evening I listened to the debate on the Bill in the Legislative Council, and found that several of the members objected to the idea of a Bill of this magnitude being introduced in the House of Assembly within two or three days of the date set for closing, and they also felt that the Bill had been passed without discussion upon the recommendation of that informal committee, and they were not prepared to deal with it. They felt that a Bill of this importance should be introduced during the early days of the session and be the subject matter of full debate. One or two of the members pointed out that many weeks ago the Bill had been submitted to the Committee referred to, that during the period of several weeks they had it under consideration, that they had dealt with it section by section and that the Citizens' Committee were prepared to see the Bill passed in its present form. They recognised that the Bill was not a Government measure; as a matter of fact, they knew that the Mayor of the City and the City Council had expressly requested that it should not be so regarded and that the Government was not in any way responsible for the introduction of the Bill or its contents, but that its passage was the unanimous act of the House on the recommendation of the committee. They pointed out that if the Mayor and Municipal Councillors or the informal committee of members of the House of Assembly or any other body desired to have a Bill of that sort

passed it should have been introduced much earlier than it was, but the Committee had taken a very long time in which to get it in shape and they felt it would take them a considerable amount of time to debate it, and there were many amendments which during the debate would be introduced. The motion that the Bill be read that day six months was moved by Sir Patrick McGrath and seconded by the Hon. J. J. Murphy. Several members of the Legislative Council, particularly the Hons. Mews, Gibbs, Shea and Campbell, expressed their deep regret at finding that the majority of the members of Council were not prepared to pass the measure at this session, and on motion being put the Council rejected the Charter. That action rendered this Bill necessary, the third section being added by the Legislative Council in Committee stage as I have already stated. I feel sure that the entire House, particularly the members for St. John's East and St. John's West ,will concur with me in my deep regret at the fact that the Legislative Council was not prepared to accept the recommendation of the informal committee of the House, backed by our unanimous support. On the other hand, I appreciate the fact that this Bill was not introduced in this Chamber at a time when it was possible for it to be fully debated; it was delayed in this Chamber for two or three days as a courtesy to which the Citizens' Committee was fully entitled, the House in my opinion having acted properly in deferring the Bill at their request. I fully appreciate the fact that the Legislative Council could not have time to debate such a lengthy document containing many hundred sections with any degree of completeness, and from the debate I gather that the amendments which would be introduced would be of such a nature as to entail very considerable debate in this House, and it would undoubtedly be necessary for them to be submitted to the Citizens' Committee for their consideration. Under these circumstances this House has to face the inevitable and see the Bill which had been reported upon by the informal committee of the House and had been passed unanimously by us here, dropped for this session. Before the Municipal Bill was introduced into this House at all I informed the House that it was my plan to have business completed by Saturday last, and when the matter of the adjournment of the consideration of the Bill was before the House on several occasions, while I concurred in the adjournment as being a necessary courtesy to the Citizens' Committee, I nevertheless pointed out that the time was very limited and that every day which passed meant less time for the Bill to be debated in both branches of the Legislature. I regret exceedingly that the Legislative Council has not been pleased to fall in line with the views of this House in connection with this measure, but fully appreciate the fact that neither this House nor the Council ought to be asked to deal with a Bill of this magnitude during the last days of a very lengthy session. As I have already pointed out, this Charter is not a Party measure. It was expressly stated to me by the Mayor that he did not want the Bill introduced as a Government measure, on the one hand, nor as an Opposition measure, on the other. The delay in bringing the measure into the House is not a matter for which either the Government or the Opposition is responsible. The Committee which had it in charge worked on the Bill very diligently, but took many weeks to complete their labors, and it was to me a matter of very great surprise that when they brought in the Bill when the session was more than nine weeks old, when

the date of the expected termination of the session had been announced, and when, as a matter of fact, for a week previous the Government had been refusing to introduce new legislation, they should expect the Bill to receive the consideration which it deserved and pass both branches of the Legislature. So far as this Chamber was concerned it did receive consideration. It was not debated at all, but accepted unanimously on the report of the committee. The Citizens' Committee concurred in its passage subject to amendments which they thought it probable would be secured at the next session of the Legislature. It is imperative that this new Bill should now pass through all its stages so that it may be assented to when at three o'clock this afternoon His Excellency the Governor will prorogue the Legislature; otherwise the city will be without a Municipal Government after the 31st day of December of this year and until an Act is passed at the next session of the Legislature, which in the ordinary course of events, could not possibly take place earlier than the latter part of January or the first of February next.

The suggestion of my hon. friend, Mr. Fox, that the Govt. is in any way responsible for this measure is entirely incorrect. It was not a Government measure. The Mayor of the city expressly stated that he did not desire to have it a Government measure. The Bill as submitted was the report of an informal committee of members of the House, of which the honourable member for St. John's East was one. I was not a member. The suggestion that the Government is responsible for the delay in the introduction of the Bill which resulted in its being dropped by the Legislative Council is utterly absurd. The honourable member knows better. The Bill was introduced at the request of the committee after it was known to every member of the committee and to every member of the House that it was intended to conclude business on Saturday last, and, as a matter of fact, it was introduced a week after the Government had taken the fixed stand of refusing to introduce new legislation. I am not blaming the Committee for undue delay, as I am aware that the Committee had been working upon the bill for many weeks, but the fact remains that the Bill was passed unanimously by this House without debate, on the recommendation of the Committee, in the dying hours of the session. Its rejection by the Legislative Council was to me a very great surprise, but they were within their rights in taking the position that the Bill had been introduced in the House of Assembly within a few days of the date set for prorogation, that it had not been debated in the House of Assembly at all and that it was incumbent upon them to discuss the matter fully. That is their prerogative as members of the Legislative Council, and while I feel that their decision in this particular instance was wrong, yet the decision was theirs and for it they are prepared to assume the full responsibility. Personally I did everything in my power to secure the passage of the Bill through the Legislative Council. I went to the trouble of attending the Legislative Council yesterday afternoon and early yesterday evening, and again late last night and spared no effort to explain the provisions of the Bill upon which information was sought. The Bill was not a Government measure and the opinion of the members of the Legislative Council thereon was so divergent that the chances of securing its passage was quite hopeless. I interested myself in the matter not as leader of the Government, but as the senior member for St.

John's West. The suggestion that the Government is in any way responsible for the defeat of the measure in the Legislative Council is merely another of the Opposition's many misrepresentations and is scarcely worthy of this passing notice.

At three of the clock the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod appeared at the Bar of the House with a message from His Excellency the Governor, commanding the attendance of the House in the Council Chamber.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker and the House attended His Excellency in the Council Chamber.

Mr. Speaker at the Bar of the Council Chamber addressed His Excellency as follows:—

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR EXCELLENCY:—

The House of Assembly has voted the Supply required to enable the Government to defray the Expenses of the Public Service.

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

"An Act for raising by Loan of a sum of Money for Railway and other purposes."

"An Act to Amend the Revenue Act 1905."

"An Act to Amend the Act Sixty-one Victoria (1898) Chapter Eight entitled 'An Act Respecting Salaries.'"

"An Act Respecting Certain Retiring Allowances."

"An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for Defraying certain expenses of the Public Service for the Financial Years ending respectively the 30th day of June, 1920 and the 30th day of June, 1921, and for other purposes relating to the Public Service."

"An Act to amend the Business Profit Tax Act, 1917."

"An Act to amend the Income War Tax, 1918."

"An Act further to amend Chapter 35 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled, 'Of the Postal and Telegraph Services.'"

"An Act Respecting the Department of Posts and Telegraphs."

"An Act for the Confirmation of a Contract with the Susu Shipping Company, Limited."

"An Act to Amend Section 9 of Chapter 139 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Encouragement of Agriculture.'"

"An Act to Regulate the Exportation of Salt Codfish."

"An Act Respecting the Issue of Certain Debenture Bonds of the Colony."

"An Act to Amend Cap. X of 9-10 Geo. V entitled 'An Act with Respect to Existing Tenancies and the Ejectment therefrom.'"

"An Act to authorize the Montreal Trust Co. to do Business in the Colony of Newfoundland."

"An Act Respecting the Preservation of Beavers."

"An Act Respecting Licenses to Cut Hardwoods."

"An Act Concerning Former Enemy Aliens."

"An Act to Amend the St. John's Pilotage Act, 1917."

"An Act Respecting the Maintenance of Certain Public Roads."

His Excellency withhold his assent to the Bill "An Act Respecting Certificates of Masters and Mates."

His Excellency was then pleased to make the following speech to both branches of the Legislature:

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

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

I am glad to be able to relieve you from the responsible duties of this extended Session and I desire to ex-

press my appreciation of the zealous manner in which you have applied yourselves to the discharge of your legislative labours.

Many of the measures to which you have given your attention are of great importance to the future of New- regulations regarding our staple industry will result in an improved cure and enhanced value, while the control of the forwarding of shipments should prevent over-stocking of the markets. The legislation in respect of agriculture makes the commencement of a policy which is constructive, and will tend to positive results. The Department of Posts and Telegraphs has been created, and the Service will now receive the personal attention of a responsible Minister, who will take into immediate consideration the important problems demanding solution. In common with many other countries, Newfoundland has awaked to the value of Education, and the necessity for an improvement in our present system. The Department of Education has been established and special attention will be given to the training of those who devote themselves to the profession of teaching. While the higher branches of Education will not be neglected, special consideration will be given to the Elementary Schools. An effort will be made to bring the great boon of education within the reach of every boy and girl in Newfoundland.

It is very gratifying that the returns of the fiscal year just closed show the Colony to be in a sound financial position.

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

I have to thank you for the liberal supplies which you have made for the various Departments of the Public Service. These will be expended with regard to economy and efficiency.

Mr. President and Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

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

In taking leave of you at the close of this Session, I am glad to note that the prospects are favourable for the industrial operations of this year. I desire to express my sincere wish for your prosperity and general welfare.

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 ———— the ——— day of ———— next, then and hereto be holden; and this General Assembly stands prorogued accordingly.

APPENDIX

[Following is Mr. Hibbs' speech on the subject of Agriculture which was inadvertently omitted from its proper position on page 464.]

MR. HIBBS:—Mr. Chairman, I crave the indulgence of the House while I make a few remarks on the question before the Chair.

I do not pose as an agriculturalist, and so it is with some diffidence and trepidation that I approach the subject. I regard the science of agriculture as a science of the greatest industry in the world, and one on which the whole universe depends for its very existence. To show that this science has been so very improperly practised, if practised at all in this country, is the subject which I would like to deal with.

I am glad that the Government is about to launch on a new agricultural policy, and I wish it much success, and I sincerely trust that it shall be productive of some good.

Reference have been made to the policy of the late Government, and while I am not going to abuse or even accuse the late Government of having done nothing, I regret to say that their policy has fallen much short of what I believe was anticipated.

It is my firm conviction, sir, that four years from now we will be judged, not by what we say of the mistakes of the late Government, but what we ourselves shall have accomplished during that period.

I have had some little experience in helping to carry out the agricultural policy of the late Government in the District of Harbor Main, which, as pointed out by the hon. member for Harbor Main, Dr. Jones, is more or less an agricultural district, and a few remarks on my experience gained in that connection may not be out of place.

While I am fully aware of the many faults and shortcomings of the agricultural policy inaugurated some ten years ago when the Morris Government assumed office, in justice I have to admit that some benefit did accrue, even though it was very little in comparison with the amount of money expended during those years. The chief feature of that policy was the distribution of live stock, seeds and agricultural implements throughout the country.

In so far as the live stock was concerned, I regret to say that it was not productive of as much good as one would wish. A large percentage of the animals imported and distributed had a peculiar habit of dying prematurely or disappearing mysteriously, some under very suspicious circumstances. Still in spite of this it is only fair to say that a slight improvement in the stock of cattle and sheep was noticeable in various sections of the country.

In connection with the distribution of implements, I have to confess that some of the farmers realised some benefit therefrom.

One of the assential features of farming, neglected by the small farmer in the outport, is a rotation system. The practise in the past has been to grow one crop continuously in the same land for a number of years.

I have known sections on the South Shore of Harbor Main District where hay was continuously grown on one piece of land for 20 to 30 years. I know sections where potatoes have been continuously grown on one piece of land for the last 60 years without any change of crop. This is surely not conducive to economical farming, but it is very difficult to disabuse the people's mind of old ideas. In fact in a great many settlements up to recent years one could not find a one-horse sod-turning plough, and it being practically impossible to turn sod with the ordinary plough used on potato land, the consequence was that the land remained either in hay or potatoes for many years, principally because of the lack of proper implements of cultivation.

The distribution of farming implements went a long way to remedy this state of affairs, and speaking with personal knowledge I do not know of any section of Harbor Main, east of Holyrood, where the Society there has not placed a suitable one-horse sod-turning plough, as well as a steel roller and harrow, and a cultivator.

In justice to the policy of the late Government I have to say, that with all its shortcomings the distribution of farming implements in the section referred to, was of considerable value to the farming class of that section.

I cannot say as much in favour of the live stock distributed, the cause of which must be attributed to a great extent to reasons which I will later point out.

I have always been a strong believer in a properly equipped and conducted Model Farm on a scale proportionate with our requirements.

It will be remembered that the Government led by Sir Robert Bond introduced this method of improving our agricultural system, and whether the Morris Government approved of that policy or not, they must of necessity make some change, because of the condemnation of that Model Farm during the election campaign of 1908 and 1909, consequently they launched on the well known People's Party policy which has been subjected to so much criticism, a great deal of which has been deserved.

I contend, sir, that the Colony has very little to its credit as a result of that policy. Our farmers know no more to-day about farming than they did 10 years ago. No effort was made to enlighten or educate the small farmer as to how he should carry on that occupation in the best possible way to secure the greatest return. The old slipshod methods which our forefathers practised are still in vogue, but preparing as we are to-day to inaugurate something more scientific and no doubt calculated to stimulate and encourage farming in Newfoundland, it does not behove us to come in here and spend our time condemning the late Government because of their mistakes, but rather is it our duty to make some improvement on their policy, and profit by the experience of the governments of the last ten years.

I have much confidence in this new departure. One of the reasons is that the Agricultural Department has a very capable head in the person of the Hon. Dr. Campbell. He has had some agricultural experience, coming as he does from an agricultural centre, Prince Edward Island, and that, coupled with his undoubted energy and enthusiasm, will I feel sure, appeal to everybody as being part of an essential necessity in a person who is to achieve anything worth while from an agricultural standpoint. I believe he is one of the best men that could possibly be secured for the job. Whenever one happened to meet him he never fails to impress you with the agricultural needs of the country and

to explain some of his ideas, which I consider very practical indeed. However, he has a big job on his hands, and my only regret is that owing to so many pressing needs the Government cannot see its way clear to grant at least 100,000 instead of the $55,000 now voted to enable the Minister to carry out his policy in a more extensive manner.

I have to congratulate the Doctor upon the magnificent report which has been turned out this year. I think it is the finest I have ever seen issued in the country. Some of the features which appealed to me were the business like statistics and illustrations which indeed make it appear like a real agricultural report, which is more than can be said of some of the reports published during recent years.

Whether or not we shall ever secure an improved stock of Aryshire or Holstein cattle, Stropshire sheep or Berkshire pigs, it is at least very consoling to see their pictures appear in a Newfoundland Agricultural Report.

And again, another encouraging feature is, that in that report is contained a promise of better things to come. It is certainly an improvement upon the reports issued for the last six years which did not contain even a promise. It seems that the late Government had resolved to do nothing, and of course the report contained nothing of a promising nature.

There is an important, though deceptive, feature of all those reports which I would like to refer to. It is that part which gives an annual report of the amount of hay, potatoes and other vegetables and root crops grown in the Colony, and I want to say right here that those reports are very misleading, and seldom if ever such as to warrant any reliance. I know exactly how those reports are got up, and I know they do not constitute even a near estimate of the crops grown in any section.

It is obligatory on the Boards to send in an annual report. It is usual then for the Secretary and Chairman to combine their knowledge of the farm crops grown within their jurisdiction, which very often extends over an area of 10 to 20 miles. In most cases they are not personally acquainted with a large number of the farmers residing within that section and have not the remotest knowledge of the crops grown, and in the absence of any accurate information they simply hazard a guess of the quantity of hay, potatoes, turnips, etc., and the figures arrived at is generally so ridiculously low or so ridiculously high as to be absolutely absurd, yet this report is received by the Agricultural Board, is incorporated into the report and sent out through the country as reliable statistics of our farming operations.

It is something similar to the fishery report sent in by Fishery Wardens and Customs Officials around our coast line, who in many cases have not the remotest idea of the amount of fish caught during any week of the season, but have to get up some kind of report with the off-chance that it might be near the truth, and this unfortunately is accepted as a basis for calculating the catch, and is often ridiculously inaccurate.

Mr. Chairman, it is my firm opinion that if we are to issue an agricultural report in the years to come, that legislation must be enacted making it compulsory for farmers to send in a report of the crops harvested by him at the end of each season. This would not entail much work, as every farmer knows pretty accurately how many tons of hay, and barrels of potatoes and turnips, etc., grown on his farm during the season. Then and not till then will we have anything like a reliable

report of which the Board can take stock, if I may use that term, and until this is done, sir, it is equally impossible for us to find out what our annual consumption amounts to. At the present time we only know the amount of potatoes we import, but have no conception of what we actually consume.

This reminds me that we imported last year hay and potatoes to the value of $236,000. If other vegetables imported last year were included it would no doubt amount to $1.00 per head of our entire population. This is surely, not good enough.

It is about time that something was done in this country to relieve this state of affairs, and I believe with the establishment of a wise, prudent policy along scientific lines that will encourage and impart knowledge to the people who are engaged in agricultural pursuits, that the amount of money annually sent out of this Dominion to purchase hay and vegetables could be saved to the people of this country.

In selecting live stock, a great deal of care, in my opinion, will have to be exercised. The Department must see that nothing but animals best adapted to our climatic conditions should be brought to this country.

I remember years ago in an endeavour to secure a better breed of cattle, I secured some Short Horn calves from the A.N.D. Co., Grand Falls. They grew to be very fine animals, one cow weighing, when butchered, 750 lbs., but I soon discovered that this stock was not best suited to our cold and rugged climate, and I think the Grand Falls people themselves discovered the fact, as I understand they have substituted Ayrshire and Holstein on their farms there during the last few years.

With a properly conducted Model Farm I believe that after a few years practical demonstrations of scientific farming could be given throughout the agricultural sections of the country.

While the distribution of literature would have some effect I am not at all a great believer in it as the sole means of education in this Colony. Some people will read it, some more won't spare the time, and a number of others are perhaps unable to read, and I see no means as effective as a practical demonstration by persons sent out from a Model Farm.

The conditions under which farming is done by the average small farmer throughout the country is indeed deplorable. Old ideas and methods are clung to with great tenacity, and unless we can prove by a practical demonstration, which can be observed by everybody, that their methods are not the best, I fear it would be hard to convince them.

My idea would be to have the soil scientifically analyzed by some representative from the Model Farm to determine just what the soil contains and what it is deficient in, so that an intelligent idea may be obtained as to what kind of Fertilizers are best suitable for that particular farm and to have the crops sown and cultivated under modern methods, the results obtained in this way would go further to convince the farmer of the wisdom of improvement upon his old-time methods than any other argument.

This practice has worked well in Canada and would, no doubt, have the same effect here. By this method the farmer gains an intelligent knowledge of the different elements he must restore to his soil, and in what proportion nitrogen, phosphoric, lime, potash or any other fertilizing agency may be profitably applied.

The chief Fertilizer on Root Crops used throughout Conception Bay is barnyard manure, which when properly conserved is undoubtedly the best.

Most people are in the habit of using spruce boughs for bedding purposes. This material is not a liquid absorbent, and consequently is of little value in that respect, but it is very difficult to persuade the people of their error in depleting the forest of those young trees, which some day would develop into timber which is so badly needed. It is hard to estimate the loss sustained by the country through this wholesale destruction of young trees for the unprofitable purpose of bedding. The result of using those boughs is to keep the barnyard manure loose, permitting the air to penetrate the pile when fomentation is set up, and the most valuable part of the Fertilizer, in the form of nitrogen is burnt up. It is a common sight to see the farmer's only hope of restoring fertility to his soil being leached away by the Spring's rain, or the ammonia going up in steam from the manure heap.

While at Troru Agricultural College in the Winter of 1913 I asked Professor Cummings, who is the Principal of that College, what in his opinion was the fertilizing value of boughs mixed with barnyard manure. The matter appeared to be so foreign to anything he had ever heard before, that it took considerable time for me to explain to him that our people actually cut up the branches of spruce trees for this purpose. His opinion was, if the stuff would rot he did not think it would do any harm, but it certainly was of no fertilizing value whatever.

While at Truro I, learn something in connection with the quality of Stock imported by the Newfoundland Agricultural Board. Attached to that College is an expert, whose services was offered to one of our Agricultural Commissioners who went over there, for the selection throughout Nova Scotia of pure bred stock.

This offer, however, was turned down for some reason best known to the Commissioner himself, and instead a wily speculator whom I happened to know in Truro purchased the animals for the Newfoundland Board, at considerable profit to himself I understand, and when the gentleman from the College went over to the railway cars to inspect the bulls and rams, etc., he was surprised and disgusted to find some of the poorest scrubs that could be picked up on the ranges of Nova Scotia being shipped over to the innocent and much deceived Agricultural Societies of Newfoundland.

It is probable that the nature of the stock imported had something to do with the mysterious disappearance of some of the animals, for it is a well known fact that they were very prone to meet untimely ends and in many cases the country did not suffer much by their demise, but it is a crying shame that money should be squandered in the purchasing of such stuff when it could be utilized in securing a full bred class of cattle that would infuse new blood in the very indifferent stock hitherto raised in this country.

This is an example which the Hon. Minister of Agriculture, Dr. Campbell, will do well to profit by, and in any importation of live stock made by the Government, nothing but the very best stock obtainable should be purchased, and those of the breeds as I said before best suited to the climatic conditions of Newfoundland.

Some discussion has taken place in this House as to the advisability or otherwise of the Government granting a bonus for the purpose of encouraging farmers to clear land. Arguments have been adduced against that policy and it was pointed out that it had not worked advantageously in the past.

While I admit that a great deal of deception was practised when the policy was inaugurated many years

ago, I would also like to remind the House that a great deal of good was accomplished, and I have no hesitation in stating that we have thousands of acres of land yielding crops to-day that would never be under cultivation if it were not for the bonus.

The Government of that day discovered that the farmers did not always clear the land sufficient for cultivation before claiming the bonus. I have some recollection of a supervisor getting in trouble for giving a certificate for bonus where the land was not cleared, but that policy was revised, and only half the amount of bonus was paid when the land was cleared, the other half being withheld until the crop was over the ground and that trouble was therefore remedied.

I know of many places where good crops are being grown on land which was cleared under the bonus system.

I sincerely hope that the Government will see its way clear to have an additional grant earmarked for the purpose of encouragement for land clearing. I would like to go on record as being in favour of the policy of giving a bonus for land clearing under proper supervision of the Agricultural Department.

Another important point in connection with the Agricultural programme is the making of better roads. To my mind Agricultural improvement and good roads go hand in hand. We cannot have one without the other.

I have in my mind many sections throughout the country where there are splendid tracts of land of very fertile soil and quite capable of producing excellent crops, but the people have no access to this land because of the lack of roads. There should be no need of importing vegetables from Prince Edward Island when we have plenty of arable soil in our country awaiting cultivation.

I know a particular settlement named Victoria Cove, in the District of Fogo, where there are splendid sections of land just back of this settlement, but the people cannot cultivate it because they have no means of getting to and from this land.

In this connection I intend asking the Government for a sum of money sufficient to construct a good road there.

I have had requests from several sections of Fogo to send them seed potatoes. If sections like Victoria Cove were properly cultivated sufficient root crops could be grown to supply their own needs as well as other nearby sections not so fortunately situated.

In reference to canker, I do not think there is so much need to be alarmed on that score. I have never taken the matter as serious, as I believe we will never be troubled with any great calamity through canker in this climate where the frost penetrates to a depth of two and three feet. It is a noticeable fact that in exposed sections where the frost penetrates the soil the canker seems to be eradicated, and usually disappears, and I believe that severe frost is a potent factor in exterminating the canker germs. In more sheltered sections where early snow-falls cover the ground and remains, and the frost do not penetrate, the canker is more in evidence.

Mr. Speaker, I do not hope for any extraordinary agricultural developments in this country because to say the least we have not an agricultural country. While some sections of the country are undobtedly very fertile, at the same time climatice conditions are very much against us, but I firmly believe, that with a proper fostering of this industry we could become self supporting, that is as much as we can ever hope to accomplish.

It has been stated by some that you cannot make a farmer out of a fisherman. I don't understand what is meant by that term, only in as far as it is impossible for a person to be fishing and farming at the same time, but to say that our fishermen during spare time cannot intelligently cultivate a small garden in order to raise his own vegetables is preposterous. One would infer from remarks of this kind that the fisherman is not intelligent enough to make a farmer. This, sir, is not true. I know some fishermen who tilled their little gardens in a very intelligent manner and with good results, and I know of no reason why even a fisherman farmer is not capable of profiting by information imparted from Agricultural Headquarters as well as many other persons.

In conclusion I must again congratulate the Hon. Dr. ampbell upon the energy and zeal which he is undoubtedly putting in his work and with the theoretical and technical knowledge which he possesses of agricultural problems, supported by his optimism and activity. I look forward to greater results in the Agricultural Districts than we have hitherto experienced in this country.

I believe when the late Government inaugurated their policy they meant well, and I only censure them because they persisted in their policy for ten long years, even after it must have been apparent to every person that it was a mistaken one.

I believe that if the Leader of the Opposition, Sir Michael Cashin, had come back from the polls with the majority last Fall he would be bringing in a Bill similar to the one before the House, for I am sure he must have seen that there was a lot of room for improvement in the Agricultural methods adopted and carried out by his party during the last decade.

I would like to say a great deal more on this subject, but there seems to be a feeling that you are in the wrong atmosphere to discuss agricultural problems at any length, and I will therefore bring my remarks to a close, but the country will be pleased to know that in conjunction with our Fishery Legislation we have also endeavoured to promote that, which is after all the greatest industry on earth, namely, the cultivation of the soil.

Before sitting down I wish to reiterate the hope that is the Government will see its way clear to carry out all that is aimed at in this Model Farm project, including a bonus to industrious and deserving people to enable them to extend their farms by clearing more land, and thus placing our country in a position to be independent and self supporting in the matter of Agricultural Products.

INDEX

ADDRESS IN REPLY.
Motion for, 27.
Committee on, 27, 31.
Draft, 31.
Presentation of, 309.
Governor's Reply to, 309.

ARCHIBALD, MR.
On Speech from the Throne, 183.

ABBOTT, MR.
On Address in Reply, 206.

AGRICULTURAL BILL, 397, 403, 470, 517, 535, 559.

BEAVER BILL, 542, 547, 565, 580, 589.

BUDGET SPEECH, 632.

BUSINESS PROFITS TAX BILL, 397, 429, 432, 562, 564, 578.

BENNETT, MR.
On Speech from the Throne, 82.
Shipbuilding Bill, 295.
Standardization of Codfish Bill, 346.
Legislative Disabilities Bill, 419.
Business Profits Tax Bill, 431.
Fire Patrol Bill, 455.
Exportation of Codfish Bill, 507.
Beaver Bill, 567.
Housing Bill, 656, 657.
Supply, 747, 785, 791, 828.
Coal Situation, 845.
Ways and Means, 871.

BILLS, LIST OF, 957.

CASHIN, SIR M. P.
On Resolutions of Condolence, 19.
Motion for Address in Reply, 27, 136.
Speech from the Throne, 112, 113, 117, 119, 128.
Fishery Regulations Bill, 121.
Shipbuilding Bill, 262, 266, 301.
Information Respecting Codfishery Bill, 314.
Standardization of Codfish Bill, 333.
Legislative Disabilities Bill, 422, 435.
Fire Control Bill, 461, 462.
Exportation of Codfish Bill, 481.
Supply, 664, 673, 674, 680, 782, 821.
Ways and Means, 864, 866, 867.
Railway Loan Bill, 918, 940.

COMMISSION OF INTERNAL ECONOMY, 195.

CROSBIE, SIR J. C.
On Speech from the Throne, 77.
Shipbuilding Bill, 297.
Survey of Vessels Bill, 375.
Legislative Disabilities Bill, 408, 411, 414.
Business Profits Tax Bill, 430.
Women's Franchise Bill, 449.
Profiteering Bill, 450, 472, 473.
Agricultural Bill, 472.
Masters and Mates Bill, 538.

CONDOLENCE, RESOLUTIONS OF, 19, 20.

CONSOLIDATED STATUTES BILL, 31, 73, 107, 154.

CONFISHERY INFORMATION BILL, 158, 314, 359, 366.

CERTIFICATES OF MASTERS AND MATES BILL, 447, 449, 517, 535, 651.

COMMEMORATION DAY BILL, 606, 741.

COMPANIES' BILL, 647, 660, 819.

CHEESEMAN, MR.
On Speech from the Throne, 160.

Standardization of Codfish Bill, 345.
Exportation of Codfish Bill, 498.

LOCAL AFFAIRS BILL, 534.

DIVISIONS.

On Motion to Adjourn pending the finding of Royal Commission, 17.
Shipbuilding Bill, 306, 307.
Legislative Disabilities Bill, 442.
Beaver Bill, 485.

DEBENTURE BONDS BILL, 479, 518, 559, 565.

DEATH DUTIES BILL, 397, 402, 445, 451, 480, 594, 596.

EXPORTATION OF CODFISH BILL, 366, 514, 518, 542, 559, 910.

ENEMY ALIENS BILL, 542, 547, 586, 589, 590, 595.

ELECTION BILL, 606, 616, 631, 648.

EDUCATION BILL, 829, 849, 892, 900, 910, 951.

ESTATES OF DECEASED ESQUIMAUX BILL, 912, 950.

ESTIMATES—MARINE FISHERIES DEPARTMENT, 850.

EDUCATION, HON. MINISTER OF
On Education Bill, 892, 901.

FOX, MR.
On Speech from the Throne, 64, 67.
Post and Telegraphs Bill, 254, 307.
Shipbuilding Bill, 267, 288.
Standardization of Codfish Bill, 336, 342.
Legislative Disabilities Bill, 433.
Women's Franchise Bill, 444, 617.
Export of Codfish Bill, 499, 505.
Master and Mates Bill, 535.
Sealfishery Bill, 602.
Protection of Animals Bill, 617, 629.
Supply, 771, 794.

Ways and Means, 881.
Keeping of Dogs Bill, 911.

FINANCE AND CUSTOMS, HON. MINISTER OF
On Speech from the Throne, 216.
Business Profits Tax Bill, 430.
Supply, 747.

FOOTE, MR.
On Shipbuilding Bill, 265.
Codfish Exportation Bill, 494.

FOOD CONTROL BILL, 32, 74, 108, 154.

FIRE PATROL BILL, 397, 403, 446, 452, 480, 517, 594.

GOVERNOR, HIS EXCELLENCY
Speech from the Throne, 4.
Assents to Bill, 819, 057.
Prorogues the Assembly, 958.

GOSSE, MR.
On Speech from the Throne, 210.
Survey of Vessels Bill, 379.
Local Affairs Bill, 592.

GRAND BANK HARBOR BILL, 360, 366, 389.

HIBBS, MR.
On Speech from the Throne, 165, 166, 168.
Local Affairs Bill, 170, 171, 172, 525.
Agricultural Bill, 958.

HIGGINS, MR.
On Speech from the Throne, 98.
Shipbuilding Bill, 267, 285.
Legislative Disabilities Bill, 404, 405.
Income War Tax Bill, 429.
Women's Franchise Bill, 449.
Fire Patrol Bill, 466.
Profiteering Bill, 479.
Fish Regulations Bill, 506.

Certificates of Masters and Mates Bill, 540.
Local Affairs Bill, 601, 604, 610.
Election Bill, 629.
Housing Bill, 655.
Supply, 662, 725, 727, 730, 736, 738, 741, 817, 835, 837.
Coal Situation, 840.
Ways and Means, 873.
Education Bill, 905.
Railway Loan Bill, 941.
Municipal Bill, 952.

HOUSING BILL, 921.

INFORMATION RESPECTING CODFISHERY BILL, 578.

INCOME WAR TAX BILL, 428, 479, 517, 535, 596, 609.

INDUSTRIAL SOCIETIES BILL, 32, 73, 107, 154.

JONES, DR.
On Speech from the Throne, 44, 199.
Fire Patrol Bill, 463.
Road Bill, 592.

JUDICATURE BILL, 250, 363, 369, 379, 389, 564.

JUSTICE, HON. MINISTER OF
On Speech from the Throne, 218, 219.
Shipbuilding Bill, 276.
W. P. A. Bill, 320.
Standardization of Codfish Bill, 336.
Judicature Bill, 363.
Exportation of Codfish Bill, 512.
Local Affairs Bill, 612.
Women's Franchise Bill, 621.
Supply, 741.

KEEPING OF DOGS BILL, 631, 648, 910, 951.

LEGISLATIVE DISABILITIES BILL, 238, 250, 404, 432, 452, 590, 594, 596.

LICENSES TO CUT HARDWOOD BILL, 518, 535, 563, 578, 589, 595, 720.

LOCAL AFFAIRS BILL, 590, 594, 603, 615, 819.

LIBRARY COMMITTEE, 394.

LeGROW, MR.
On Motion for Address in Reply, 23.
Fish Regulation Bill, 159.

MARINE AND FISHERIES BILL, 269, 271, 323, 360, 547.

MONTREAL TRUST COMPANY BILL, 515, 541, 563, 578, 631.

MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS BILL, 740, 755, 898, 936, 781, 819, 957.

MOORE, MR.
On Supply, 693, 720.
Coal Situation, 841.

MacDonnell, Mr.
On Shipbuilding Bill, 269, 297.
Standardization of Codfishery Bill, 338.
St. Lawrence S. S. Company Bill, 380.
Legislative Disabilities Bill, 404, 455.
Fire Control Bill, 454, 464, 466.
Exportation of Codfish Bill, 496.
Beaver Bill, 569.
Supply, 686, 813, 814.
Education Bill, 900.

TARGETT, MR.
On Women's Suffrage Bill, 619.

MARINE AND FISHERIES, HON. MINISTER OF
On Fish Regulations Bill, 137.
Shipbuilding Bill, 191, 256, 265, 272, 304.
Standardization of Codfish Bill, 310, 326, 349.
Information Respecting Codfishery Bill, 314, 359.
Survey of Vessels Bill, 322, 333, 373, 374, 378.
Legislative Disabilities Bill, 412.
Exportation of Codfish Bill, 424, 502, 514.
Certificates of Masters and Mates Bill, 537.
Beaver Bill, 566.
Herring Fishery, 869.

MESSAGES—
Concurring in Bills 307, 467, 547, 594, 631, 819, 949, 951.
Requesting Concurrence in Bills 442, 451, 452, 609, 936.
Commanding Attendance at Bar of the House, 819.

NEWFOUNDLAND MEDICAL BOARD BILL, 32, 74, 107, 154.

OUTPORT STREET LIGHTING BILL, 423, 442, 452, 594.

PRIME MINISTER, HON THE
On Resolutions of Condolence, 17.
Speech from the Throne, 222.
Posts and Telegraphs Bill, 250, 255.
W. P. A. Bill, 320.
Standardization of Codfish Bill, 353.
St. Lawrence S.S. Company Bill, 370, 383, 384, 385.
Susu Shipping Company Bill, 392.
Legislative Disabilities Bill, 433.
Profiteering Bill, 443, 477.
Registration of Midwives Bill, 446.
Fire Control Bill, 452, 465.
Local Affairs Bill, 525.
Postal and Telegraph Service Bill, 549.
Licenses to Cut Harwood Bill, 589.
Election Bill, 616.
Women's Franchise Bill, 621, 623.
Housing Bill, 652, 667, 809.
Supply, 664, 844, 931.
Municipal Bill, 899, 952.
Trustee Investments Bill, 909.
Railway Loan Bill, 913, 919.

PROFITEERING BILL, 475, 514, 517, 535.

PILOTAGE BILL, 589, 593, 595, 602, 609, 720.

PROTECTION OF ANIMALS BILL, 595, 596, 617, 627, 741.

PUBLIC ROADS BILL, 602.

PUBLIC WORKS BILL, 32, 74, 108, 154, 442, 451.

POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS BILL, 32, 191, 250, 307, 559, 589, 631.

PATRIOTIC FUND BILL, 936.

POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS, HON. MINISTER OF
On Standardization of Codfish Bill, 351.
Postal Telegraph Service Bill, 547.
Beaver Bill, 585.
Housing Bill, 657.

PUBLIC WORKS, MINISTER OF
On Survey of Vessels Bill, 321.
Local Affairs Bill, 603, 610.
Railway Loan Bill, 949.
Speech from the Throne, 242.
Beaver Bill, 568, 582.
Road Bill, 592, 599.

PETITIONS.

Sullivan, M.S.—28, 363, 394, 650.
Walsh, W.—29, 75, 254, 586, 613, 651, 911.
Justice, Hon. Minister of—30, 33, 156, 246, 271, 321, 363, 388, 447, 514, 521, 891.
MacDonnell, Mr.—32, 109, 156, 361, 365, 401, 586, 780, 799, 891, 898.
Public Works, Hon. Minister—33, 76, 248, 372, 520, 780.
Higgins, Mr.—76, 77, 192, 249, 366, 543, 651, 666, 829, 912.
Shipping, Minister of—109, 110, 396, 520.
Small, Mr.—110, 155, 158, 179, 180, 401, 515, 606, 648, 660.
Scammell, Mr.—157, 193, 396, 829.
Halfyard, Hon. W. W.—157.
Targett, Mr.—179, 193, 309, 401, 545.
Cheeseman, Mr.—179.
Minister of Finance—193, 544, 648.
Crosbie, Sir John—246, 515, 543, 544.
Winsor, Mr.—246, 253, 309, 362, 365, 396, 780.
LeGrow, Mr.—247, 447, 799.
Abbott, Mr.—248, 310, 360, 365, 401, 514, 577, 595, 613, 660.
Hibbs, Mr.—248, 362, 365, 386, 387, 388, 515, 648, 799, ——
Jones, Dr.—253, 515, 521, 545, 606.
Foote, Hon. Mr.—254, 401, 545, 780.
Minister of Education—828.
Gosse, Mr.—310.
Cashin, Sir M. P.—321, 369, 515, 631.

Fox, Mr.—321, 524.
Coaker, Hon. Mr.—424, 545.
Sinnott, Mr.—519.
Vinnicombe, Mr.—521, 595.
Minister of Posts and Telegraphs—543, 545, 546, 912.
Bennett, Mr.—544, 632, 651, 799.
Hon. Prime Minister—627, 648.
Samson, Mr.—648, 799.
Moore, Mr.—651.
Guppy, Mr.—799.

QUESTIONS—
Cashin, Sir M. P.—52, 108, 249, 307, 310, 360, 369, 373, 389, 396, 403, 596, 607, 608.
Sullivan, Mr.—32, 110, 111, 112, 158, 310, 325, 424, 450.
Walsh, Mr.—112, 159, 249, 369, 373, 402, 432, 479, 586, 587.
MacDonnell, Mr.—32, 112, 249, 367, 369, 373, 389, 424, 450, 755, 799.
Jones, Dr.—112, 159, 249, 252, 479.
Moore, Mr.—159.
Bennett, Mr.—249, 253, 307, 310, 396, 403, 586, 596, 850, 892, 898.
Vinnicombe, Mr.—249, 253, 360, 741.
Fox, Mr.—249, 892.
Scammel, Mr.—307.
Crosbie, Sir John—32, 369, 389, 400, 402, 540.
Higgins, Mr.—400, 607, 741, 829, 850, 892, 912.
Hon. Prime Minister—527.
Sinnott, Mr.—931.
Walsh, Mr.—631, 741, 755, 799, 931, 940.
Cashin, Sir M. P.—647, 740, 780.
MacDonnell, Mr.—819.

RULES SUSPENDED—
755, 781, 829, 891.

REPORT OF
The Department of Militia, 28.
Newfoundland War Contingent Association, 28.
Harbor Grace Industrial Society, 28.
Newfoundland Savings Bank, 28.
General Hospital, 547.
Auditor General, 891.

RESOLUTIONS RE ADJOURN OF HOUSE PENDING THE FINDING OF ROYAL COMMISSION—417.

SUPPLY—
479, 632, 662, 710, 741, 782, 799, 829, 844, 850, 863, 910, 913, 931, 936, 951.

SMALL, MR.
Motion for Address in Reply, 21.

SCAMMELL, MR.
On Address in Reply, 96.
Codfishery Information Bill, 315.
Beaver Bill, 567.

SHIPPING, MINISTER OF
On Speech from the Throne, 211, 213.

SINNOTT, MR.
On Speech from the Throne, 82.
Supply, 765.

SAMSON, MR.
On Speech from the Throne, 199.
Education Bill, 907.

SPEAKER, HON. THE
On Speech from the Throne, 5.
Survey of Vessels Bill, 375, 377, 378.
Keeping of Dogs Bill, 910.
Road Bill, 592.

SULLIVAN, Mr.
On Speech from the Throne, 34.
Shipbuilding Bill, 273, 275.
Standardization of Codfish Bill, 337.
Fire Patrol Bill, 459.
Beaver Bill, 571.
Women's Franchise Bill, 626.
Supply, 703, 708, 711, 718, 720.
Railway Loan Bill, 941.

SHIPBUILDING BILL, 75, 256, 271, 310, 578.

STANDARDIZATION OF CODFISH BILL, 32, 310, 564, 565.

SURVEY OF VESSELS BILL, 269, 271, 321, 336, 363, 373, 389, 578.

SUSU SHIPPING CO. BILL, 360, 369, 423, 452, 594.

ST. LAWRENCE S.S. CO. BILL, 360, 366, 370, 380, 389, 547.

STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATES BILL, 397, 402, 445, 451, 452, 480, 594.

SEAL FISHERY BILL, 578, 590, 602, 603, 609, 951.

SALARIES BILL, 950.

REGISTRATION OF MID-WIVES BILL, 397, 402, 446, 451, 481, 594, 596.

REVENUE BILL, 891, 898, 918, 920, 951.

RAILWAY LOAN BILL, 913, 951.

RETIRING ALLOWANCES BILL, 951.

TRUSTEE INVESTMENTS BILL, 909, 951.

TREATIES OF PEACE BILL, 740, 799, 951.

TENANTS BILL, 535, 542, 563, 565.

TERRA NOVA SULPHITE CO. BILL, 647, 659, 663.

VINNICOMBE, MR.
On Women's Franchise Bill, 449.
Exportation of Codfish Bill, 513.
Local Affairs Bill, 602.
Supply, 745.

WAYS AND MEANS—863, 871.

WINSOR, MR.
On Address in Reply, 239.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE BILL, 47.

W. P. A. BILL, 239, 250, 320, 360, 365.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

During the First Session of the Twenty-Fourth General Assembly of Newfoundland

1920

UNION PUBLISHING COMPANY, LTD.

PROCEEDINGS

OF THE

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

SESSION 1920

TUESDAY, April 20th, 1920.

This being the day appointed by Proclamation for the meeting of the Legislature.

At five minutes to 3 o'clock, p.m., the House met.

At three o'clock, p.m., the Honourable Robert K. Bishop, the Honourable James D. Ryan, and the Honourable Marmaduke G. Winter, members of the Legislative Council, nominated and appointed by His Excellency the Governor as Commissioners having taken their seats the Honourable R. K. Bishop commanded the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, attendant on the Council, to proceed to the Honourable House of Assembly, and inform the members thereto that His Excellency the Governor's Commissioners desire their immediate attendance in the Council Chamber to hear the Commission read, and they being come thereto, the following Commission was read by the clerk of the Legislative Council setting out that whereas it is not convenient that the purposes for which he had called the said General Assembly together should be declared until the Members of the House of Assembly have proceeded to the choice of a Speaker, he had appointed the said Honourable James D. Ryan, Honourable Robert K. Bishop and Honourable Marmaduke G. Winter to signify to the Members of the said House of Assembly that it was his pleasure that they should proceed to the choice of some person to be their Speaker, and present such person for his approbation.

The Honourable Robert K. Bishop, addressing both Houses of the Legislature, then said:

Honourable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

Gentlemen of the Honourable House of Assembly:

It is not convenient for His Excellency the Governor to declare the reasons of his calling this General Assembly, it being necessary that a Speaker of the House of Assembly should be first chosen;

You Gentlemen of the House of Assembly repair to the place where you are to sit, and there proceed to the appointment of some proper person to be your Speaker, and present such person whom you shall so choose, here to-morrow at three o'clock for His Excellency's approbation.

The House of Assembly then withdrew.

On motion House then adjourned.

WEDNESDAY, April 21st, 1920.

The House met at three p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

At three o'clock p.m. His Excellency the Governor, Sir Charles Alexander Harris, K.C.M.G., C.B., C.V.O., having arrived at the Council Chamber and being seated on the throne, Commanded the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, through the Honourable the President of the Legislative Council, to let the Commons House of Assembly know—

"It is His Excellency the Governor's pleasure they attend him immediately in this House"

Who being come thereto.

William F. Penney, Esq., Merchant, Member for the District of Carbonear, having been presented by the Hon. R. A. Squires, Premier, as Speaker elect, and the choice approved, His Excellency the Governor was pleased to speak as follows:—

(Speech appears in first part of this volume.)

His Excellency and the gentlemen of the House of Assembly having retired, the Commission of Honourable J. D. Ryan as President was read by the Clerk.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—Mr. President, as the senior member of the Council present I desire to take the earliest opportunity of extending to you my very hearty congratulations upon the honour conferred upon you by the representative of His Majesty the King in appointing you to the honourable position of President of the Legislative Council of the Dominion of Newfoundland.

His Excellency the Governor has not alone acted with wisdom in appointing you, Sir, to preside over the deliberations of this branch of the Legislature, but has made an appointment which I feel sure affords great pleasure to every member of this House, and to the public generally. We feel, Sir, that your appointment is appropriate, that it is a recognition of what is at once due to you, and due to this branch of the Legislature of this Dominion.

I have every confidence, Mr. President, that while occupying the Presidential chair you will recognise the right of every member of the House to a free expression of his opinions, within the limits of the rules of the House, and render your decisions with impartiality and a becoming dignity; following thereby the worthy example of the honoured President who, when you first entered this Council and for years afterwards, occupied your present seat, —the late Sir Edward Shea, of whom we were all so justly proud. I welcome you again, Sir, to the Presidency of this Council and trust you may be permitted to occupy that chair for many years to come.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—Permit me, Mr. President, to extend to you my congratulations upon the very high honor conferred upon you in your appointment to the Presidency of this Council, and in so doing, I feel that I am giving expression to the thoughts of honourable gentlemen who compose the Council. In congratulating you upon the dignity and honor conferred, I feel assured that the best traditions of the office and the dignity of the Chamber will at all times have a worthy exponent and representative in you.

To you, Sir, it must be a source of pleasure that in the evening of your life an office such as President of the Council should have come to you unsolicited and unsought. It is, however, but a testimony to your probity of character and well spent life since you first left the shores of your native land and made this country your adopted home. It is also at the same time a tribute to the race from which you sprung that wherever men of Irish descent have been afforded opportunities which are

denied them in their own land they have distinguished themselves in every walk of human endeavor. It is my earnest wish that you may be long spared to preside over the deliberations of this Chamber.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—Mr. President, I would like to join in a little contribution and congratulate you upon the position you occupy to-day. In 1900 when I first entered political life I was associated with you at that time, and during all these years you have always shown exemplary interest in everything pertaining to the welfare of the country. In 1904 I was one of those who were associated with you when we became members of this House. There were four appointed. There were yourself, the late Hon. John Harvey of respected memory, and my friend to the right, Hon. Mr. Milley. At that time, Sir, the House did not extend that reception that perhaps ought to have been given, but, Sir, you were the first to take the hand and give a warm welcome to those who afterwards came to this House. I am proud to have this opportunity of congratulating you upon the exalted position that you occupy now, and I trust that you may be spared many, many years to uphold the dignity and honor of President of this Council.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT:—I thank the Hon. Mr. Bishop and Hon. Mr. Gibbs sincerely, and Mr. Anderson for the kind sentiments which he expressed. I am now at a stage where I do not take all that as pertaining to myself, but I am grateful for the kind expressions, and I shall do my duty here to the best of my ability, but I cannot expect to do it of myself. I count on your support and cooperation, and then I know we will perform our duty here for the benefit of our common country.

Ithank you very sincerely, gentlemen, for the kindly words expressed towards me, and I hope that you will not be deceived in any action which I may take during my occupancy of this seat, and if you find I am not doing my duty a kind friend will give me a slight nudge and I will take it and step down. I have received the following commisions from His Excellency the Governor: Mr. George Shea, Dr. Alexander Campbell, Mr. Frank Steer, Mr. John Browning.

Gentlemen, I welcome the new members, and from my knowledge of them I think they are an acquisition to this Chamber. As my esteemed friend, the Hon. John Anderson, has pointed out, when a few years ago we came to this Chamber we were not received with open arms, but I think it may be said of the Hon. John Harvey, the Hon. Mr. Anderson and Hon. Mr. Milley, leaving out myself, that they have conducted themselves to the entire advantage of the country, and I hope that while I am here the country will have no cause of saying that we have not carried out the deliberations of this Council to the best of our ability. I thank you sincerely, gentlemen.

The Clerk read the Speech from the Throne.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—Mr. President, since we last met here in session the Great Reaper has been busy and three of our oldest and most honoured members have been called away. Such depletion of our small membership makes a great breach and provides for those of us who are left a striking reminder of never ceasing change and decay.

The Hon. George Skelton, who was for a number of years past a surprise to us all, who tho' having attained a very great age so seldom permitted anything, not even inclement weather even, to prevent his attendance at meeting of the Council. The Hon. Dr. Skelton was a member since 1890 and will be long remembered for his genial

kindliness towards his associates and faithfulness to public duty.

The Hon. A. F. Goodridge too, who had also reached his eighty first year of age and seventh year of membership here, was one of the most valued and most highly respected members. Mr. Goodridge was always intelligently interested in the legislation of the sessions, followed keenly the bills which came before the House, and brought to its deliberations a keen intelligence and ripe experience, of which he was ever ready to give lucid expression. We all remember how during the last session when Mr. Goodridge's health was anything but robust he took a very keen interest in many of the Bills before the House and freely approved or condemned as his judgment dictated. The passing of Mr. Goodridge is a decided loss to the Legislature and to the trade and commerce of the country as well. He was one of the old school now becoming unfortunately all too few.

The Hon. John Harvey—of him what shall I say. If time permitted I should rather ask, what shall I not say. The passing of John Harvey, occurring as it did when he had but attained the age of mature manhood, has been acknowledged throughout our Dominion to be an event of Dominion-wide import, and has occasioned Dominion-wide sorrow. Throughout the length and breadth of Newfoundland and far beyond he was intimately known and most highly regarded. During the past fifteen years he occupied a seat in this Council and we have had many opportunities of observing the care and attention which he gave to all legislative enactments, and how often has his speeches evidenced the student, the judicial reasoner, the well stored mine of experience which he could draw from in relation to all the interests of the country. Very few, if any, of her sons had greater faith in Newfoundland's resources or spent more of their time and means to assist and encourage their development.

The Hon. Mr. Harvey regarded in no light manner his position and his responsibility as a Legislative councillor, and was most tolerant and broad in his attitude towards those whose viewpoint upon the matter under consideration did not accord with his own. It is not here alone, Sir, that the loss of Mr. Harvey will be felt, nor even by those of us who met him frequently in commercial and other intercourse, but throughout our city and indeed throughout our country can be found many hearts still saddened through the comparatively early passing of Hon. John Harvey.

I wish to avail, Sir, of the opportunity now afforded this Council of marking by resolution our deep sense of loss and of our regret in respect to our departed comrades, and I beg to propose the following:

HON. MR. GIBBS:—I avail of this opportunity to express my deep regret at the loss which not alone the Council has sustained but the country as well, in the death of the three members named in the resolutions of sympathy.

It was my pleasure to occupy a seat in this Council Chamber next to that of the late Honourable Mr. Harvey, and I had therefore an excellent opportunity of observing the singleness of purpose to which he devoted his energies and talents in making legislation that came before the Council as perfect as it was possible to do so. In the debates in which he participated he impressed us all with the vigor of his intellect and the facility with which he unfolded his thoughts and ideas to the Council. The various bills which came before us and the subject discussed in which Mr. Harvey took an important part showed him to be a man of wide range of knowledge and a deep student

of the development which has taken place in legislation the past thirty years. Legislation that came before the Council received at his hands keen scrutiny and serious consideration and his well stored mind and mature judgment on very many occasions were instrumental in amending bills which otherwise would not have attained the objects aimed at. He was a steady and indefatigable worker and he came to every discussion which he took part in with complete preparation. He was preeminently a fair and candid man, in debate he took no petty advantage and stooped to no unworthy methods. The lines of his friendship and confidence encircled men in every creed. In all things he had charity.

The commercial life of this country in his death has met a very severe loss. The deceased gentleman was always optimistic as to the future of the country. He loved his native land, and in the many industrial enterprises which he inaugurated or assisted in developing, he did so, not solely for the gain that may come to him, but to make Newfoundland industrially happy. As an employer of labor, his relations with his employees were of the most cordial character. No appeal to him on behalf of the worker passed unheeded. He was broad and sympathetic in his dealings with labor and recognized the worker's right to proper compensation for his toil. There was another side of his character, and that was his desire to bring succor and relief to the suffering. We can all look back and see the energy and singleness of purpose with which he roused the country to the gravity of the great white plague. The amount of work which he did, the time given, and the money he freely spent in this movement which he originated and developed until it spread throughout the Island, shows the greatness of his heart and his desire to leave the country in which he first saw the light, better than he found it. If the late Mr. Harvey had done nothing more than bring home to the minds of the people of this country the awful toll which the great white plague was annually taking in our midst, he deserved the lasting gratitude of the country.

In the Honourable Mr. Goodridge the country has lost a familiar and prominent figure in the public and business life of the country. No one could come in contact with the deceased gentleman but could fail to admire the sterling honesty of the man, his splendid talents and undoubted courage. Mr. Goodridge was a man amongst men. He possessed high intellectual attainments and great debating power. As a Parliamentary Debater on an issue squarely joined, when the ground had been chosen, he must be assigned a position in the first rank. He had a great and abiding faith in the country and loved to see it prosper. He at all times gave freely of his talents and his time to every cause that aimed to uplift Newfoundland, and his many years in the public life of the country showed him to be a man of commanding personality and of splendid abilities. Men associated in business and politics with Mr. Goodridge always have had a kind regard of his many good qualities of head and heart. He never oppressed any man. On the southern shore and in other portions of the country where his firm carried on an extensive business the name of the deceased gentleman is a household word. The mere length and variety of his public services in almost every branch of the Government of the country, whether as a member of the lower branch of the Legislature, Prime Minister or an honored member of this Council, have secured for him a conspicuous and permanent place upon our public records.

In the Honourable Dr. Skelton the

Council has lost one of those rare kindly old gentlemen of the old school, of a type which is rapidly passing away. The gentleman whose decease we deeply regret was one of those old landmarks in our public life. Scholarly and dignified, he represented the best traditions of the Council.

The loss of the gentlemen referred to creates a gap in the public councils of the country that is not easy to fill, but they have left us better titles to remembrance than any which mere office can bestow. The crowning characteristic of their lives was their liberality and their tolerance of the opinions of others. Tolerance was of their nature. Let us therefore bind fresh bonds of brotherhood and of union in the cherished memories of those who have gone before us. I beg leave to second the motion.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—As one of the older members of this House and one who has been associated with the late members who have now been mentioned, I rise with a great deal of pleasure, though with regret at their demise, to support the resolution that is before this Chamber. This House during the past fifteen years has had many changing scenes. When we first came to this House in 1904 the President was the late Sir Edward Shea, father of the gentleman recently appointed to a seat in this Chamber. I refer to the Hon. George Shea, whose father occupied the position of President of this Chamber for very many years and rendered valued services to his country. At that date there were eighteen members of this House. Twelve are gone and have been promoted to the great assembly above. There were in the Council these members: Hon. Sir Edward Shea, the Hon. George T. Rendell, Hon. Samuel Blandford, Hon. J. D. Ryan, Hon. John Harris, Hon. J. S. Pitts, Hon. James Baird, Hon. James McLoughlan, Hon. James Angel, Hon. John Ayre, Hon. Dr. Skelton, Hon. John Harvey, Hon. George Knowling, Hon. Mr. Greene, Hon. Mr. Bishop, Hon. Sir Edgar Bowring, Hon. Mr. Milley, and myself. Out of these eighteen who occupied seats in this House at that time there are six remaining. There are four in the House at the present time, our honored friend the President, the Hon. Mr. Bishop, Mr. Milley and myself. There is also the Hon. George Knowling, who is not with us to-day on account of his health, and there is also Sir Edgar Bowring, who is now the High Commissioner for this Colony in England. Such changes show us what may take place in a brief period of fifteen years. We never know who may be next, and it is only a duty that we owe to ourselves and our country that while we are here we should do good for those who come after. I join with the mover and seconder of the resolution, believing that the good example that these men have left behind them will be followed by those that are here to-day. I support the resolution, Mr. President.

HON. THE PRESIDENT:—I join in supporting the resolution proposed by Mr. Bishop, seconded by Mr. Gibbs and ably supported by Mr. Anderson. I have had a knowledge of these gentlemen for many years. As Mr. Anderson has stated, the Hon. Mr. Harvey was one of the members appointed when we were, and there is a distinct loss to this country in the passing of Mr. Harvey. As to the genial Dr. Skelton, he was an extraordinary man for his years. On stormy days he very seldom missed putting in an appearance in this Chamber. With the Hon. Mr. Goodridge I was very familiar, because, living in the same neighbourhood as he, I very often met him going to his business, and he was very seldom late, and it was only within the last few days that he did not walk to

his business in the morning although he was nearing eighty years of age. His death was a distinct loss to the country, as, with the other gentlemen who occupied seats in this Chamber when we entered it—I refer especially to the President of the day—he did his utmost for the betterment of the Colony. On stormy days when it was a danger for a person of his years to come out, he very seldom failed to put in an appearance in this Chamber. However, God, in His own time removed him from his friends, and, as Mr. Anderson has stated, twelve have departed since we took seats in this Chamber.

The resolutions were then put to the House and carried.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—In rising to move that a Select Committee be appointed to draft an address in reply to the Speech with which His Excellency has opened this session, I wish in the first instance to thank hon. gentlemen for the welcome they have extended to myself and the other hon. gentlemen newly appointed to this House.

The speech as delivered by His Excellency foreshadows a very great amount of legislation that will no doubt tend to the general advancement of the Colony and it is well that this is taken up as mentioned here that the trade generally throughout the world and conditions generally have been so disorganized, and a great amount of reconstruction will have to be undertaken in all countries by legislators, and more so probably in this country than in others which have been progressing at a more rapid rate, and have taken advantage of advanced thought more so than we have. I fear that we in this country have been too lax in taking advantage of much improvement and advanced thought that have emanated from outside sources. We have rather been content to go on in a great measure in the old way until driven possibly by circumstances to make some alterations. The unrest in this country is having I think very great influence in making us, in business and in our legislative duties, consider what is to be for the future. This speech outlines a very large program of legislation. His Excellency refers also to the ships that have been donated by the Admiralty. No doubt these will be of great service, and were much needed by the country.

The speech also refers to the dispute outstanding for many years between this country and Canada in relation to the Labrador boundary. It is well indeed that this matter is now to be taken up, and in a short time probably will be settled, as to what jurisdiction either country will have in the territory in dispute.

A matter of great importance referred to in the speech, deals with fishery matters, and I am very glad indeed that on the assumption of office of the present Government, they put into force regulations for the conserving of our fish markets. Of course in all new things there must be a difference of opinion, and in such a country as this where we hate to depart from old customs and adopt new ones, it seems very radical for the Government to step in and regulate the price and sale of fish to foreign countries. But I think sane people on looking around and seeing that the trade of the whole world at the present time is being regulated and conserved and guided by the governments of the several countries, will admit that it was a wise step on the part of the Government here. There is a difference of opinion as to the form of carrying out these regulations but there can be very little difference of opinion as to the principle involved, and we hope that in the coming session that such regulations will be made as will meet the sympathy of the whole country, and that all will

give their aid in carrying them out. The fishery is our one great industry, and probably less has been done for it than any other. Different governments have passed legislation as to cull and other things, but they have never been carried out with any degree of firmness. Consequently instead of their being of benefit, as a practical result they have been worst than none at all. Some persons claim that these regulations prevent competition. Well the only competitions this country can have are those countries which produce the same article as we do, and these are the only ones we ought to have in disposing of our fish. There ought not to be competition between one and the other of our export merchants which will tend to depress the price of fish in our foreign markets. While it is proper that a minimum price should be made here, the competition between our merchants ought to be what they can get over and above the minimum price set for our fish.

The first principle in dealing with natural products, to my mind, is that the property of the individual who may have them in their possession. What I mean is this that supposing a fisherman has been fitted out with boat and all necessaries for catching the fish, goes to the grounds and catches his load of fish, and the feeling though the country is that that fish is his. To my mind that fish is not his, but it belongs to the country. It is a trust reposed in him and his proprietary interest in it is only in so far as the labor that he has put into the catching of it. Therefore it is right and proper and the absolute duty of the Government of the day, to see that on the fish being caught the fisherman will handle it so as to give the best results to the country and they be the arbiter as to what should be done with that fish. They should make such regulations to see that that fish is properly cured and everything done to make it a profitable article. At the present time it is a disgusting scene to go in a fishing stage as I have and seen them washing out fish in water grey with the offal and slime of that fish. How could it be possible for fish handled in that manner to be anything but bad? I want to enunciate the principle that the natural resources of the country are not the property of the individual, but merely a trust. That trust is conveyed to the fish merchant and while he may pay him for the product of his labors he transfers his trust, and it is further transferred for the handling and disposing of in the foreign markets. So that it is right and proper and entirely in the province of the Government to take hold of all products of the country and conserve them to the general good of the community.

Another most important matter in the speech is that regarding the Department of Marine and Fisheries, that a department of scientific research is to be established. There can be no two opinions as to the benefits of such a department, particularly in a fish business; and in fact almost every manufacturing concern at the present time is developing scientific research, and endeavouring to provide the very best food that can be made of a product.

Another matter is the way ships are being built, and the risks that our people are taking in going abroad. It is most surprising that up to the present time we can procure men to go in many of the crafts at present sailing the waters.

The Government are also creating a Department of Education. That to my mind is the best thing in the speech, for education applies even to the catching of fish, for an intelligent man will give greater attention to his products than an uneducated one. I am pleased indeed to see that such a department is to be created. Our fullest

energies should be devoted to seeing that every child in the country is educated. It is a disgrace that there were so many illiterates in both our Regiment and the Naval Reserve; some of the best we have in the country and fifty per cent of them illiterate. I think the Government ought to have all support to the fullest extent in passing measures to compel every parent to send his child to school; that it ought not to be optional with the parent to send his child, but he ought to be compelled to send him. There has been an endeavour to create a higher education in this country, but I think it has absolutely failed, and I hope it is the intention of the Government in this department of education to devote their whole energies to the three R's. Higher education is a matter for individual effort and not so much for the Government. It is only within very few years that any grant has been made to Higher Education or to any of the Universities in England; and only a few of them are getting any grant to-day; the University of Bristol being the first to receive a grant. The whole of the Higher Education is done by individual effort and not by the government. I hope that our Department of Education will take this matter in hand so that every child in this country will be able to read and write and figure intelligently. Many at present are supposed to read and write who really do not read and write intelligently.

I understand that it is the intention of the Government to organize a Normal School so that the teachers that go to the several outports will be fully qualified. At present they are at a great disadvantage. No doubt many of them do very good work, but in the aggregate they are at the disadvantage of imparting information which they may not possess.

With these few remarks, I beg to propose that a Select Committee be appointed to draft an Address in Reply to the gracious speech with which His Excellency has been pleased to open this Session of the Legislature.

HON. MR. STEER:—Mr. President, I rise to second the motion that a select committee be apopinted to draft an address in reply to the gracious speech with which His Excellency has been pleased to open the present session of the Legislature.

One cannot help but note with satisfaction the volume of useful, practical and beneficial legislation foreshadowed in His Excellency's speech.

Legislation aiming at the better cure and cull of our fish, and the protection of shipments of same in foreign markets.

Legislation establishing regulations for a survey of our foreign-going vessels, and making provision for the safety of their crews; a matter which has been so lamentably neglected in the past.

Legislation for the creation of a Department of Posts and Telegraphs, the present system having become absolutely unreliable, worn-out, and obsolete.

Legislation for the betterment of our transportation service, both coastwise and internal; the condition of which has, owing to varied causes, come to such an acute stage of in-efficiency.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the proposed creation of a Department of Education is indeed a step in the right direction, for there is no question of doubt that our Educational facilities are utterly inadequate, there being, in the City alone, over one thousand children who can have no prospects of obtaining even the most elementary education, through lack of accommodation.

The same may be said of the re-organization of the Department of Agriculture and Mines, for Agriculture has failed to make the advances in the past that it should have done, and

the lessons taught thereby should prove useful in helping towards hoped for success in the future.

I am pleased to note from His Excellency's gracious speech that the Government is taking up in earnest the Housing problem. I congratulate the Government on their effort to improve the social conditions and the home life of our working-men. The Government, Mr. President, is only doing what every Government in the British Empire is doing at the present time.

I understand that the Company hope, during the present year, to erect at least thirty houses, which, when completed, will be occupied by tenants taken from slum houses, the aim being to have the latter then condemmed and destroyed and so make room for the building of decent habitations.

It is, I think, also a matter for approval that the practice, carried out in the past, of submitting Estimates far below the actual anticipated Expenditure (and thus easily passed) and the trusting to Supplemental Supply for the over expenditure, I say that such practice should be discontinued, and that bona fide Estimates, getting as near as possible to the anticipated Expenditure should be presented.

The securing of three steamers, two by gift, and one by purchase, from the British Admiralty cannot but meet with approbation, especially when we take into consideration the losses sustained in shipping during the past few months; and the application of one of these boats for rescue and emergency purposes will supply a need long felt.

It is also a matter for congratulation that there is at last some prospect of a settlement this year of the long outstanding dispute between the Province of Quebec and this Colony as to the boundary line on the Labrador Peninsula.

Mr. President, standing, as I do today, for the first time on the floor of this House, I take this opportunity of expressing my sincere appreciation of the honor conferred upon me by His Gracious Majesty, the King, and I hope and trust that when my record here is finished, it will prove to be one showing duties well, faithfully and conscientiously performed, and upholding in every respect the best traditions of this august Chamber; and before resuming my seat, I would like personally to heartily congratulate you, Sir, upon the honor conferred upon you by your appointment as President of this Council.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—Before commencing my criticism of the matters in the speech, I would like to felicitate the hon. mover and seconder on their maiden speeches in this Chamber. I hope we may have opportunity of hearing them from time to time, as they will be able to throw some light and afford some assistance to us in the various deliberations we shall have to engage in. I do not propose to traverse the whole of the gracious speech from the Throne; I would like to limit my criticism to that portion which was so fully enlarged upon, if nebulusly by the hon. proposer of the Address in Reply. The paragraph of the speech reads as follows:

"Promptly after its assumption of office the Government established regulations to protect the fishing interests of Newfoundland in their foreign markets, and it is pleasing to know that the establishment of the regulations has been attended with much success and substantial benefit to our codfish industry. The fishermen of Newfoundland will be invited to co-operate earnestly with the Government in its effort to improve the cure of codfish. It can reasonably be anticipated

that if the cure of fish be improved so that a prime article is produced, the price of Newfoundland codfish will continue at good values."

With that paragraph I cannot agree. The Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has a record in this country for endeavouring to raise the social and economic condition of its people to a higher level than heretofore. He enjoys the reputation for having successfully and to a large extent achieved his purpose, but acting on that success he has promulgated resolutions that have not only done great injury to the country in the past but are continuing to do still greater harm in the future. It is impossible to see just what benefit has accrued to the country through this policy; and moreover of the two or three millions of dollars which have been sunk on codfish exportation; a large portion is due to the regulations which have been formulated by the Department of Marine and Fisheries. It is impossible to maintain that supply and demand have nothing to do with fixing the prices of products; and to attempt to do so is contrary to first economic principles. We have here, by proclamation prescribed rules whereby holders of fish are not able to sell except under certain fixed prices. This has had the result time after time that instead of bringing more money into the country; the country has suffered severe losses and a far greater loss than a money loss has been incurred by the establishment of a want of confidence in future business enterprises of the country. I venture to say that as a result of this, business men must approach the new era with the greatest diffidence and I think that the future will bear out that statement when we take into account the large contraction in business that must necessarily follow that want of confidence. The Hon. Mr. Coaker I give him all credit for what he has done; but one of his advisors only two days ago cabled out to his firm the following message and I think that it ought to appear on the records of this House so I read it. It is from Mr. Walter Monroe and reads: "My opinion is regulations now detrimental to the interests of country; if continued, curtail supplies to minimum. Give publicity." Now here is one of the Advisory Board who goes to the old country and realizing the Board's mistake promptly wires his firm that if these rules are continued he must sustain substantial money losses in his business. That I think is a good answer to the optimism of the Hon. the proposer for an address in reply and to the person who drafted this paragraph of the speech from the Throne.

The Hon. Mr. Browning in the course of his remarks talked about standardization. I should like the Hon. gentleman to tell us what he means by that word. He also talked about cure. But what does he mean by standardization? Our catch is already standardized and the following extract from a letter I have just received must explain itself and show how the Italian standardize. It is dated Italy, March 22nd: "We finally landed our fish. Damp being 10/ reduction. Third Class 30/. White Stink 33s. Black Stink reduced 48s." Now if that is not standardized fish I would like to know what is. If white stink and dark stink are terms of standardization I would like to enquire what the meaning of standardization is. We surely want co-operation but we do not want arbitrary prices to bolster up prices and be undersold by competitors in other producing countries.

Exporters have sunk in my opinion between two and three million dollars during the past season and the outlook for marketing fish now is far from pleasant. I contended and I maintain that these losses are largely the result

of the proclamation whereby we cannot sell or ship fish outside of this country unless up to a certain consignee; and this has eliminated competition in the marketing of our fish and left us with a large stock on hand. I hope when this matter is taken in hand that it will be with the advice and concurrence of those who carry on the fishery exporting business. With an experience of over half a century I am quite satisfied that the basis of prices is best determined by competition; and the people affected are not only the exporters themselves but all our people; for if we are arbitrary we allow our competitors to take advantage of our position and undersell us in our markets. We are going to have a large quantity of codfish on our hands and unless these rules are speedily abrogated and the merchant is allowed to exercise his own rights in connection with his fish, we are only courting graver disaster.

I hope when the Ministers arrange and formulate new rules in connection with this matter that they will take the whole trade of the country into their counsels, and not leave it to a few people—misguided I hope—and accept what they think just. You will generally ascertain what you want in the counsels of the majority and should not adopt the ideas of the minority. I would therefore think that the whole trade of the country should be considered.

But I am not going to go into particulars at this time. These are just general remarks with respect to these regulations, and come from me with absolute sincerity and lack of bias. As a result of them first the confidence of the country has been destroyed; and in bringing about such a condition the authorities are subjecting this country to a great risk. Only by an immediate withdrawal of these regulations can confidence be maintained by and with our people and if you take away from them this confidence the result will be a largely diminished and curtailed supply for the fishery. That would affect the whole industry of the country and affects every man and tradesman and labourer. All are equally affected by the business of the country; and it is therefore to be hoped that this confidence will be preserved and this cannot occur unless saner counsels prevail than obtained when these fishery regulations were thrust upon our people.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—Mr. President, just a few words with your permission. I imagine I hardly went so far in the matter as the standardization of fish. I think I merely gave the idea that the fishery of our country was a trust and that our fishermen are the guardians of that trust; and it is the duty of the Government to see that that trust is being fulfilled; forasmuch as it is the duty of the Government to see that that fish is properly handled, cured and otherwise prepared as an article of food. If such were done there would be no such thing as stink fish. That must be caused entirely by lack of washing. If a fish is not washed in clean water, there must a film which continuing to surround the fish must eventually cause it to think. That is where scientific study would be worth while; and there would be very little trouble with stink fish. I do not think I went further in my address, but deferred further comment until the regulations themselves came up.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—Mr. President, I do not desire to prolong this debate but I would like to take some few exceptions to the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Grieve. Mr. Grieve enunciates certain principles of political economy which have been exploded long ago. He has grown up under an old school known as the Manchester school; one of whose principles was unrestricted

competition. Under the principles of that school the people of England sent their goods to the foreign market at whatever price they could obtain; and the competition in the markets of all these different countries was so keen that it forced down the price with the result that the traders had to return to England and there force down the price of work and to such a condition of affairs did this principle of unrestricted competition land the people that they became far worse off than the Slaves of the West Indies; and had to work hard and without ceasing not to give them and their children a decent livelihood but to get sufficient to keep body and soul together. And everyone who has studied out this whole question knows that it reduced the people of England to a depth of degradation unknown to any other country of the world. Yet in view of this, this is the principle that my learned friend wants to see introduced into the fisheries of this country. In other words there must be no regulations whatever in the standardization of our fish. Every merchant who purchases the fish is to be permitted to sell it at any price that he may see fit, regardless of any obligations which on his side are to be discharged. He may be forced to sell it lower in price than was paid for it, in order to sell it at all. That is a mistake. Trade should be regulated. No man has or ought to have the right to buy or take an article without having to pay the person from whom it is bought sufficient remuneration for the trouble and industry bestowed on it.

The Hon. the mover has enunciated the correct principle and that is that the person who markets fish is not acting for individual gain. He is only the trustee for the people from whom he in turn purchased; and it is an absolute duty binding on him to see that such a price is obtained for him as to give those from whom a price is obtained proper reward for their services. What we want is regulation of trade. The principle of supply and demand has been tried and found of the same effect the world over. In its working it is found that the people who produce suffer from the drop in price caused by the keenness of the competition. That was the principle in England until recent years, forgetful of the fact that every man had certain rights which society could not dispute; and is entitled to fruits from his work sufficiently remunerative to enable him as his work would justify. In other words there is a duty on those who market our products to see that the returns therefrom are sufficient to fully compensate the worker, and if they fail in this duty it then becomes the duty of the Government; and the Government that does not make this its duty is not doing its duty by the people. The principle of supply and demand has been exploded years ago so far as trade and industry and those employed in it are concerned. The Hon. gentleman has grown up in that school which thinks otherwise and when we grow up in one envirement we find it hard to change our views. This is the reason then that after his studies in that school which recognises the principle of supply and demand my learned friend is unable to accept the dictum of a principle which runs contrary to his teachings on that subject. That the whole industry should be allowed to use its judgment in the sale of its products, and in all the other circumstances in connection therewith without heeding the counsels of the community is preposterous. The commuity has certain rights and these rights must be at all costs protected. For these and other reasons then, Mr. President, I feeled called upon to support the proposer and seconder of this motion.

Mr. President, while I am on my

feet I may be permitted to make a few remarks on another subject.

We have among us to-day, Honourable Gentlemen, who for the first time have taken their seats in the Council. Men, who will by their talents and ability very materially aid in the work which will come before us. Honourable Mr. Shea has been long and honorably identified with the public life of the country, of a family who has given to Newfoundland some of its most distinguished sons. In the person of the Honourable gentleman that high order of talent which distinguished his forebears will not diminish. I feel assured that his work here will be characteristic of that devotion to public duty, unfailing courtesy and dignity which his distinguished father, the late Sir Edward Shea, who so ably filled the position of President of this Council, always practiced during his public career.

Honourable Mr. Browning is well known to the people of the country as a successful business man, long and honorably identified with the trade and business interests of the country whose well stored mind and practical knowledge will aid us very materially in our deliberations.

In the Honourable Mr. Steer we have a name that has been for upwards of three quarters of a century connected with the business and public life of the country. In the Honourable Mr. Steer the Council has a member of wide practical knowledge and experience who I feel assured will use these qualities for the benefit of the country with which the name has been so long and honorably identified.

The Honourable Dr. Campbell is an accession of strength to the Council. He is one of the most successful students of medicine that McGill University has during recent years given to the profession. During his career as a Medical man, he has had degrees conferred upon him by the most renowned schools of medicine and surgery. In him, we recognize a self-made man, one scorning obstacles in his path and winning his way to recognition by his superior talents and indomitable energy.

I tender to the Honourable Gentlemen my most cordial congratulations, and I feel assured in so doing I give expression to the thoughts of Honourable Gentlemen of the Council.

The motion was then put and adopted.

The Committee named by the Hon. President was Hons. Mr. Browning, Steer, Anderson, Murphy and MacNamara.

Hon. Mr. Shea tabled reports.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea, Council adjourned until Monday at 4.30 o'clock.

MONDAY, April 26th, 1920.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Browning the Address in Reply was read a first and second time.

HON. MR. SHEA:—Mr. President, will you permit me first to join in the general chorus of congratulation from all parts of the country on your appointment as President of this Council. I hope you may be long spared to preside over the deliberations of this Assembly, which I am sure you will do with credit to yourself and the Colony. I would also like to thank hon. members of the House for the cordial welcome to myself and colleagues when we took our seats here first last week. For myself I have only to say that as long as I have a seat here I hope my conduct will be such as will merit the esteem and respect of every member sitting here with me.

I would like to say a few words in reply to the remarks of my hon. friend on my right, Hon. Mr. Grieve, who spoke a few days ago on the Fish Regulations. I cannot say that I know

how the hon. gentleman himself felt towards these regulations, and I know they were not in accordance with his views. But I was somewhat surprised at the statement he made with respect to the losses that accrued; that were solely due, he said, to the regulations put in force by the present Government. I am not personally very conversant with the business of the export of fish in this country, but like yourselves I have learned a good bit since the regulations were put in force and I can hardly imagine that the losses of three millions could have been attributable to the imposing of these regulations, considering that they did not come into effect here until well on in the month of November when certainly a large portion of the fish had been exported; and to say that the losses on that fish from the end of November until March were three millions, was, to say the least somewhat of an exaggeration. Now there are lots of gentlemen in this community who are conversant with the export of codfish who say that if these losses or any did occur,—and we believe certainly there were serious losses in connection with the export of fish,—they would have been very much more severe and more heavy if these regulations had not been put into effect. So that it was difficult from the beginning when the regulations were put into effect for any outsider like myself who might wish to take an unbiased opinion on any question generally, to come to any conclusion. In the first place, you have some fourteen or fifteen people exporting and from the beginning half of these were condemning and the other half hailing them as the saviour of the trade. The trouble about this question from the outset has been that it was made a political question. It has never received the consideration it should have received, because it was made nothing more or less than a political football from the beginning to the end. Now there was nothing new, nothing secret about this. We know the export of our fish was giving the late Government serious consideration last fall, and a committee was formed, not by the Government but at their approval and that prominent members of that Government were then in accord with making regulations and putting restrictions on and controlling the export of fish and more particularly in regard to the price. Well now that the committee was formed and the hon. gentleman on my right was a member of that committee.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—I was not in the Colony, and could not have been a member. I did not arrive here until the end of the year.

HON. MR. SHEA:—Well, I am very sorry I made the statement. I was informed you were. I was informed a committee had been formed to take up the matter of the exportation of fish and regulate it and put it under control; and that committee did a certain amount of work. But the Government of the day did not officially connect themselves with that committee, because they did not consider it expedient to do so. Then the elections took place and these regulations commenced to be used as a political football. All through the elections they were used as a means to turn down this Government in power because they had introduced them. And that has been the trouble from the beginning to the end in regard to this question. It was impossible for any outsider to form any opinion. You had a few men saying they were absolutely imperative, and the other few saying they were absolutely disastrous. One of the first things they did was to take up the question of raising the standard of fish so far as price was concerned. They did so. They were abused right and left in the bye-election in the West

End. As I have said before, this question was then raised again, and was used as a political stick to beat the Government's back, and from the beginning to this time the whole question has been treated as a political issue, to the detriment of the entire trade of the country. When the present Government came into power the Honourable the Minister of Marine and Fisheries made it one of his first official acts to get this thing to some extent under Government control, and he did so. He was vilified and abused and condemned from all quarters by the Opposition Press and by the members of the Opposition themselves. However, he carried through the work, and up to the present I do not see where disaster has been caused. I am not sufficiently conversant with the working out of these regulations to know, but at any rate it is commonly said by those who ought to know, and who do know, that if we have had losses they came in the ordinary course of trade and would have come with much more severity and much more effect if there had been no control whatever. Now this question of Government control over matters of commerce and over matters of finance and matters of shipping is quite a new thing; a few years ago no Government of the day would think it within their province to interfere with control of any such matters, but the whole condition of the world has changed; Governments all over the world now are closely allied with all questions of commerce and trade. The powers for the time being of the Government of a country are mixed up with all questions of trade, shipping facilities and matters of finance, and Governments have been forced, and we have been forced, to change ideas held in former times. We have been forced more so from the fact that we had to face a combine called the Consorzio formed to take over the control of the importation of fish, which combine was backed by the Italian Government and whose only sole object was to control the importation of fish and its price, to the detriment of this Colony. The Government was compelled to take equally drastic steps here, and there was no alternative left for them but to deal with it in the manner they did. That is the whole history of this question, and I am very sorry, Mr. President, that the honourable member who is perhaps one of the greatest authorities in this country on the matter of the exportation of codfish, who had devoted a life-time to it and whose opinion is so valuable and second to none in this country, should have taken this stand; I think it is a mistake and will do no good, but now he has taken this stand I think he should confirm it in the way of figures in support of the statements he made here the other evening. I am sorry he did take such a stand; I do not think that any good will come out of it; I think it was a mistake, and I fancy he must have made his statements without giving them the due consideration that he usually gives to his utterances, whether made in this House or elsewhere. Now, we have the interest of the Government in this matter,—the interest of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; the interests of all concerned are, so far as I can see, identical with those of the trade of the country. We are all interested in the conservation of the fisheries; we are all interested in the standardization of the fish, and, more particularly, are we interested in the matter of price. The only question is, who is going to do it? We are all agreed on the point that the higher the price we can command for our fish in the foreign market, the better it is for the country, and we should all work with one effort for that purpose. It is only a question as to whether Mr. A. or Mr. B. or Mr. Somebody Else should

do it. The present Minister of Marine and Fisheries has devoted a considerable amount of time to this: he is a man interested in the exportation of fish, in as much as he is President of a very large exporting company. He is in the same position as the Hon. Mr. Grieve, or Sir John Crosbie, or Messrs. Harvey & Company or any other large exporting firms. They are all agreed on one thing, and that is, that the matter of price is the main consideration. So the question is, who is to deal with the matter of price, and that is the question all through these regulations. Politics have entered into it, and have been tearing the stomach out of it. If there are any merits they have been trampled under foot. We have had the Press opposed to the Government publishing editorials that must necessarily have been talked into the editors, because they knew nothing about the exportation of fish. They were working it as a political stick to beat the Government in the bye-election in St. John's West. They rang the changes on it, and their utterances were thrown forth to the people with the idea of impressing upon them what the disasterous results would be if Messrs. Squires and Brownrigg were returned and that these fishery regulations would lead to untold misery. I am sorry, Mr. President, that things took such a turn, because I believe the country has suffered for it. The regulations themselves are only experimental. No one says they are perfect. They are not, like the laws of the Medes and Persians, unalterable, but they are capable of amendment and improvement and they will be improved as time goes on. The Honourable the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has been on the spot himself. He has been on the Continent; he has seen the people who are handling the situation; he is a practical man and knows about the fishery, he is interested in only one thing, and that is the uplift of this country so far as the fisheries are concerned, and he is not going to embark on a policy that will bring trouble to the fisheries of this country. I have every confidence, Mr. President, that the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries will come out at the right end. He has shown that he has a grasp of the situation; he is identified with this fish corporation which has no other interest but fish, and his whole time since the present Government came into power has been spent in endeavouring to bring system out of the chaos which existed in the Department of Marine and Fisheries before the present Government took charge. Now, Mr. President, I do not intend to dilate further on this matter. As I said before, I think the honourable member who made the statement that a loss of $3,000,000 here was solely attributable to the proclaiming of these regulations ought to furnish figures to confirm his statement, so that not only the House, but the country at large, should know the situation.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—I must protest here against being associated with any political party in connection with my views on fish matters, and in support of that statement I would like to say that a few days after my return to this Dominion, in conversation with my honourable friend, Mr. Shea, I said that in my opinion these regulations were calculated to do a great deal of harm, but that I preferred not to make any move in the matter until the conclusion of the bye-elections lest it should be imagined that I was mixing up politics with commercial matters, and that the remarks which I would make, and subsequently did make, were not made by me as a partizan in support of any political party. I had no such intention in addressing this House last week, and now I wish to say that any remarks I made in con-

nection with fish matters were made by me as a private member of this House, and as an exporter in this country, and were not made with any idea of impeding the Government in the carrying out of these regulations. But surely I must be allowed freedom to express my opinions without having improper motives attached to them in their expression. I have been a long time connected with the fisheries of this Colony, and I have seen the ups and downs of the exporting merchant for well night fifty years, and I consider I am as good an authority to form an opinion as to what is best as the honourable member who represents the fishery department in the present Government. I agree with my honourable friend Mr. Shea that Mr. Coaker's aim and object is to better the material condition of the fishermen of this country. Now Sir, if we are to form a correct opinion of matters and arrive at a right conclusion, it will entail a review of all the circumstances of this matter. I speak from hearsay only, and am open to correction if I am wrong. In the month of October or early in November the President of the Fishermen's Protective Union received a deputation consisting of one of our merchants and the foreign agent or representative of that merchant and others, who paid two visits to Catalina or Port Union, and following shortly afterwards, on the 20th day of November, a bombshell appeared in our midst in the shape of a proclamation forbidding the export of codfish unless to arrive in such a manner, and if not so to arrive confining the receipt or care of it to one party. This applied to Italy and Greece, and either at that time or subsequently Portugal was included. The only country that was left free was Spain. On telegraphic receipt of information, using my own judgment and without comparing ideas with any of my brother exporters in this country, being removed two thousand miles from them, I telegraphed to my leading directors and told them that such regulations were, in my opinion, so prejudicial and entailed such disastrous consequences that they had better restrain their buying and conclude the year with a very small stock on hand, and that instead of as in former years finding our firm in possession of thirty or forty thousand quintals, in my opinion ten thousand was sufficient. Now when one buys twenty or thirty thousand quintals the idea is of making a profit. The idea of limiting purchases to ten thousand was that my notions of profit interfered with the putting in force of the regulations, and perhaps had other people thought in the same way as I did we would have had fewer losses than at the present time. I also took the liberty of cabling the Governor protesting against these regulations, and on my arrival here I made myself more fully conversant with all the rules and regulations laid down, and my first impressions, made in November, are as strong to-day, and stronger, than they were then. I am convinced that such regulations as these are calculated to do this country a very great deal of harm. I have been told in this House that the law of supply and demand either is modified or does not exist. I am not quite sure that I am exactly quoting my honourable friend Mr. Gibbs, but I understand him to say that the law of supply and demand has practically disappeared. I trust he will correct me if I am wrong. Now by these rules we establish prices for the produce of the country,—prices which are arbitrary. We establish the arbitrary prices, by means of which we enable our competitors in Nova Scotia, in Ireland and in France to successfully market their fish. In other words, while we were asking too high prices for our fish they were realizing theirs

at lower prices and getting them out of the way. In connection with the rules in regard to the Brazilian market, it was stipulated without warning that all purchases made by Brazilians from this country were to be paid for in cash, at St. John's, in New York or in London, and that the cost of the fish and any profit on that fish and the insurance on that fish and freight on that fish were to be paid one hundred cents in the dollar before the fish would be allowed to leave. These rules were subsequently modified, when it was pointed out that they were onerous and obstructive to trade, and a new rule has been instituted by which a minimum price was established here and a margin of ten per cent allowed to the receiver to cover any claim he may have for short delivery or any damage, and in that connection I would say that one member of the Advisory Board to which my honourable friend refers, Mr. Walter Monroe, retired from the Advisory Board; he could not be a party to these Brazilian regulations. He stated publicly at a debate in the Board of Trade that he approved of the regulations as applied to the European markets, but since he arrived on the other side of the water he has been able to see more clearly what the conquences are going to be, and he has cabled out for the information of the general public that if these rules are not suspended or abrogated, so far as he is concerned as a merchant, he is going to cut down his supplies to a minimum. Now credit in this country, and credit in every country, is one of the bases upon which business is done, and I venture to say that if you call off all credit—I mean by that not extensive credit but legitimate credit—if you prevent men who have been accustomed to and who rely upon getting a small backing whereby they can prosecute the fishery, you are paralizing the trade of the country. Already distrust has been generated, and the manifestation of that distrust will be as largely seen on the part of those who supported these regulations as upon the part of those who refused to support them. I venture to say that if the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, with his Advisory Board or without it, has the right to name a certain price to be paid for the produce of this country, you are destroying competition, and if you destroy competition, you are lowering prices. It is the competition which has existed during my life time that is responsible for the prosperity of the people of the country, and we know that such a thing as combination on the part of exporters is unknown. To state figures is a difficult thing. They must be more or less speculative. I said in my speech last week that I thought the trade had lost between two and three millions of dollars through the export of fish this past year, a large portion of which was in my opinion attributable to the institution of these rules. These rules were instituted, prices were fixed, and they were not observed, and consequently there is a feeling of distrust throughout this city and throughout the country that in my opinion will do damage to the material interests of this Dominion. Now my honourable friend talks about the trade being divided on this point. Well, Sir, the trade is divided on this point, but it is not equally divided. There are fourteen or fifteen exporters against six or seven, fourteen or fifteen exporters who do not believe in the regulations as against six or seven who do, and of these six or seven already one or two have left the Advisory Board. Whether it is because they see the consequences which will arise from this style of proclamation or not, I cannot tell; the fact is that, so far as I know, their places have not been filled. It may be quite true, as my honourable friend says, that this matter has been made a poli-

tical football of. I never knew any measure in this country that was not made a political football of, each side trying to belittle the efforts of the other, but I disclaim on my own behalf any political motive in opposing these regulations. I do it simply as an exporting merchant with an experience of fifty years and with a knowledge extending to sixty. It is only my opinion. I give it for what it is worth. The future will show whether I am right or wrong. In my opinion, there is a dark cloud hanging over this country now. We have had them before and they have been dissipated. This may be dissipated, and no one would be more glad than I would be if this disappeared. In my opinion, we have not yet come to the consequences; the consequences will come in the fall of the year, when the people employed in catching the principal article of produce of the country will find it very difficult to get purchasers. The first requisite for successful business is confidence, and if you destroy confidence you handicap trade. Reference has been made to the Italian Consorzio. The Consorizo was an association appointed by the Italian Government and had the monopoly of buying and selling all the fish in Italy. One of the promises held out by the Hon. Mr. Coaker was that by the means he was establishing we would be able to do without the assistance of the Consorzio but would be able to get better terms, that instead of selling our fish and being paid at a much lesser rate than we contracted for, we would receive payment to the extent of one hundred per cent. That is not true. When I say "not true" I am not attributing to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries any bad faith, but the promise then made has not been realized. There are five or ten cargoes of fish that have been paid to the full extent. Some have been paid 80%, in other words the hopes held out to us have not been realized. Arrangements were made by which a sale of all the cod fish exported to Europe could be brought about. The portion which could be sent was proposed by cable. A party was formed. I was told that if I became one of its members I should be put on the ground floor. I was to benefit specialtly though outsiders would suffer. This difficulty, merchants from this country have had to contend with for many years. We should have agents in different markets to superintend the landing and adjustment of the cargoes. The late Government made an effort in that direction and the present Government is following it up. It would be greatly to our advantage to have men residing at the different ports. In answer to Mr. Browning's question—'In what way could harm come in standing firm on export prices?'—There would be no harm—It is much more difficult to name prices to receive in foreign countries combining one another than for local supplies.

HON. MR. SHEA:—I hope I said nothing in my remarks to which exception could be taken. With regard to these regulations I never meant in any way to make a charge against you in the political aspect. Nothing was further from my thoughts.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—Section II of the Address of His Excellency the Governor refers to the ratification of the Peace Treaty. I am sure we all join with His Excellency in hoping that peace throughout the world will long continue. Section III of Speech from the Throne refers to the gift of two ships from the British Government. These ships will be welcome. They are badly needed just now, and will be a great asset to the country. In reference to Section V—the standard and price of fish must be kept up. If the price of fish and other products are not

kept up, the purchasing power of the people will be small. It is estimated that the loss in last year's catch was three million dollars. We must remember that the price of imports into this country have greatly increased. Textile fabrics which in 1914 could be obtained for 5sh. 6d. sterling cannot now be procured under 30 shillings. Woollen and cotton have gone up five to ten times their value. It is the duty of the people of this country to look to the Government to sustain the value of exports. Effort must be made, by Parliament, to keep up the price of fish. Section VI refers to the fact that the Government is making a strong effort to close the Militia Department. Expenditure has been going on for six years. It is time to clip its wings. Section VII—The purchase of Beaumont Hamel will give us a God's Acre abroad, in which many of our brave lads sleep. There are quite a number of gentlemen in the House who are more or less interested in our imports. What has been the experience of the last two or three years? If I only refer to my own orders. We have had goods lying in Liverpood, in New York and Boston for weeks and months. October goods arrive in the summer. I make the suggestion to the Leader of the Government—he knows our requirements—that an effort be made to get some line of steamers to bring commodities into the country. I have no desire to occupy the time of the House in regard to the Housing Scheme, but I take this opportunity of congratulating the Government on what they are going to do for better housing in this city. They are only doing this year 1920 what they have been doing in Australia, in New Zealand and South Africa, in Great Britain, in Canada and the United States since the year 1917. Now we awake to the fact that we want better houses, and the Government are going to assist a Co-operative Company in doing this, and we have prepared a scheme and whoever lives to see it carried out will see that it is possible to regenerate the whole system of housing in the west end of this town. Nearly one thousand houses there are not fit to live in, and as soon as we provide homes for some of those living in them, it is the intention of the Company to tear them down and build new ones up, and I congratulate the Government on their pluck and determination in this matter. The last section refers to Divine Providence to have care over the deliberations of that body, and I can only add in this review I have given to the Speech that it will be endowed with my best blessing to the Government to carry out the program laid down here. It is true there is no relation in this to the manifesto; there can be no relation to the political, but I am prepared to give them fair and reasonable time, and I am satisfied the Government will carry them out.

HON. MR. SHEA:—I beg to move the further consideration of this debate be deferred until next Thursday.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—Before the motion for adjournment is put, I regret having to refer to the matter, and I am aware that no official reports of the proceedings have been published as yet, but on the morning of Thursday what was purported to be a synopsis of the proceedings of the previous day was reported, and incorrectly so. It appears to me I ought to call attention to it. Whether by design or not, because it might be thought, I submit, I had an ulterior motive, if I, as senior member, had neglected to congratulate you Sir. It will be aware to hon. members that I did so. Why there was an omission I do not know, but the evening papers reported in the same way, perhaps copied from the morning paper and no reference was made to my remarks, and they did not appear

in any paper published on that day or since. I refer to it because I wish to be reported officially as having joined with those who did welcome you to the position of President of this Chamber; I did so as heartily as any hon. member could.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—I quite agree with Hon. Mr. Bishop in relation to this matter, and I am sure it is within the memory of many here the last few years that speeches made here never appeared, and I do not think such a matter should occur. It seems the report in the morning paper is only a synopsis, a very excellent one no doubt, but not correct. Now these reports are sometimes copied in the evening papers, and it is looked on by many as an official report. I am sure the new Supervisor will see that it does not occur again.

HON. MR. MEWS:—In reference to Hon. Mr. Bishop's remarks it probably did not appear in The Advocate because I was not present after the opening and His Excellency had retired. I do not know if that was the period when his remarks were made, but I can assure him that it was not intentionally omitted from my paper. I did not appear until the discussion had gone on for some time. With regard to the publication of the debates, I myself was only handed to-day copy of some remarks made last session, that are only now being put up in print. It is a remarkable state of affairs that has developed in recent years, and I sincerely hope the new Supervisor will see the reports are kept up to date.

HON. PRESIDENT reported communications from H. E. the Governor granting leave of absence to Hons. W. J. Ellis and D. A. Ryan. Also from the family of the late Hon. A. F. Goodridge respecting vote of sympathy on the passing of his father.

HON. MR. BROWNING gave notice of question.

On motion of HON. MR. SHEA the House then adjourned until Thursday next at 4.30 o'clock.

THURSDAY, April 29th, 1920.

House met at 4.30 pursuant to adjournment.

Order of the Day.

(1) Address in Reply.

HON. MR. MacNAMARA: — Mr. President, I would like to say a word or two about the gracious speech of His Excelleny the Governor at the opening of the House before it goes through its final stages.

If we omit or exclude the paragraph which refers to the Fishery Regulations there will be hardly anything left in this document worthy of serious comment.

That the Fishery Regulations have been injurious to the country I believe will be admitted and I will now with your permission endeavour to produce facts and figures for making this statement.

Before proceeding, however, I will read the following from the Governor's speech before us: "Promptly after its assumption of office the Government established regulations to protect the fishing interests of Newfoundland in their foreign markets, and it is pleasing to know that the establishments of these regulations have been attended with success and substantial benefit to our codfish industry."

I have no hesitation in saying that this statement is not in accordance with the facts.

We have, unfortunately, ample evidence to show that instead of these regulations being attended with success and benefit—that the contrary has been the case.

It is estimated that the large sum of $3,000,000 has been so far lost to this country due entirely to these regulations and that further sharp losses are inevitable in the near future.

The delay caused by these regulations in marketing our fish from November to March accounted for the non-consumption of 200,000 qtls. and most of the other 400,000 qtls. which went to the Mediterranean in that period resulted in heavy losses to the shippers, aggregating in all roughly a total loss of the appalling amount of $3,000,000 already referred to.

The balance 150,000 qtls. represented the total exports from November 1st to March 1st went to South America—the West Indies and New York.

It is well known that there is nearly another quarter million of last year's catch in this Dominion still unsold and we must anticipate even heavier losses will be met on whatever proportion of this unrealized fish finds its way to the Mediterranean market.

Then again there is a large quantity of Labrador fish in our northern outports that will show a sharp loss as there is practically no market for this fish at this season of the year.

To further strengthen my argument I will read Mr. Walter Monroe's cablegram sent here from England last week.

This cablegram has been already read in this chamber by the Hon. Mr. Grieve but as there is good matter in it it will stand repetition.

Mr. Monroe says "My opinion regulations now detrimental to trade. If continued curtail supplies to a minimum."

No greater reflection as to the unwisdom of these regulations could be produced than this cablegram of Mr. Monroe's.

Mr. Monroe it must be remembered is a member of the Fishery Advisory Board and one of our largest fish exporters and surely when we have his opinion—an opinion which must be of value, otherwise he would not be on the Board—these regulations cannot therefore be regarded otherwise than a failure.

Despite all these irrefutable facts isn't it strange that we are told in the Governor's speech that "The establishment of these regulations has been attended with much success and substantial benefit to our codfish industry."

If the harm done to this Dominion already only applied to this year the outlook would not be so dark but the Government by promulgating these regulations have prejudiced and embittered the fish importers of Italy, Greece, Spain and the untold illfeeling created will take a generation to eradicate and to-day Newfoundland is practically blacklisted with these Mediterranean fish buyers.

Another thing if these Fishery Regulations were at all necessary—which I deny, the Government started the wrong way and the wrong time to carry them out.

They should have waited until the beginning of this season's operations and until the fish was standardised before putting a pistol to the heads of the Mediterranean buyers when they knew not what quality of fish they had to offer—and until we knew the fish we had was reliable and unlike one cargo at least that became rotten in transit and had to be destroyed at port of destination as totally unfit for human consumption.

Now Mr. President I submit that price fixing by law is not workable and will be found impossible to carry out.

There might possibly be an exception to this case if we were the only country in the world producing fish—like Greece for instance the sole producer of currants—but when we have Norway, France, Iceland and other fishing countries competing with us price fixing will be found practically of no advantage.

When we assembled here at the

opening of this House on the 21st April the scientific and wireless world was straining its ears and nerves to hear some dot or dash from the Planet Mars —this planet being nearest the earth on this particular date.

Unfortunately, however, the world was disappointed.

But we here in this chamber were be welcomed and that Trade Commissioners and other agents will be apcerned when the Hon. Mr. Gibbs in reply to Hon. Mr. Grieve about fishery matters made the sensational statement "that" the law of supply had exploded 30 years ago.

This is not the case. The law of supply and demand had not exploded because there is nothing in it to explode.

Further supply and demand are the two factors that determine values and no matter how you argue you cannot get away from these facts.

If the hon. member's contention that the law of supply and demand had exploded be right why I ask does the London Stock Exchange, the New York Stock Exchange, the Bourse of Paris, the Board of Trade at Chicago and other large cities still continue to regulate the price of stocks and commodities according to supply and demand.

Even the very gold which is the basis of all commerce is subject to the law of supply and demand.

The greatest political economists of to the Government that the securing of the day are agreed on this point and if we go back over 100 years to the days of Adam Smith we will find that this law of supply and demand is inexorable.

As far as I can judge there are four things to be attended to to regulate our fish business—first, standardisation; secondly, improvement in cure; thirdly, regulation of shipments, and fourthly, prohibition of consignments under certain conditions and I venture to assert if we carry out these essentials there will be no fear but our codfish industry will be placed on a sound and profitable basis.

That an Information Bureau and Scientific Research Department will be established in connection with the Marine and Fisheries Department will more fortunate as far as news was conpointed from time to time until Newfoundland is suitably represented in all its principal fish markets will be equally welcome and I hope when these appointments are made that suitable men irrespective of politics will be selected and further that natives of the country familiar with all matters pertaining to the fisheries will be given preference over all other applications for these positions.

It will be a great consolation and comfort for the friends and relatives of our fallen heroes and I might add to all Newfoundlanders to learn that the Government have secured the battlefield of Beaumont Hamel—the spot sanctified by the blood of our fallen soldiers—and have made arrangements to have the graves of these men suitably marked by war memorials and it is to be hoped that sum of the money will be allocated from time to time to keep the graves in respectable condition.

I need not enlarge on the urgent necessity of having our coastal and island transportation facilities attended to and while on this matter might I point out an additional boat or two for this service will be hardly enough to get over our present forwarding difficulties—and that the matter of a suitable premises for the quick despatch and handling of freight is of prime importance and I hope the Government will not overlook this point when dealing with this trouble.

It is gratifying to learn that an effort will be made to improve the housing conditions in town and I hope there

will be no delay in this matter as the present housing facilities suffered by some of our people are not at all healthy or desirable.

HON. MR. MILLEY:—Mr. President, Mr. MacNamara made an incorrect statement concerning Mr. Monroe. He is not a member of the Advisory Board. He was not a member when he sent the message.

HON. MR. MacNAMARA:—I understood Mr. Monroe was a member at that time. I apologize if I have made any error.

HON. MR. MEWS:—Mr. President, I feel rather diffident in speaking on the subject of Fish Regulations as I am not in the fish business; but I am emboldened by the fact that the Morning News encourages expression of opinion, and I am also encouraged by Hon. Mr. MacNamara who may or may not be in the fish business. A discussion on the theory of the regulations is one in which we can all take part. The theory of these regulations is human. These regulations would secure for the fishermen a higher price for his fish, and he will be compelled to make his fish as good as possible to merit the price put upon it.

Often in this country as in others, business begins at the top rather than at the bottom.

In the question of supply and demand it is the theory which is objectionable. Two factories manufacturing the same article—an article not produced elsewhere—stand side by side. An explosion occurs—one factory is demolished. Immediately the workers in the other factory can demand higher wages because no one else can take up the work. In this way to my mind labour is regarded too much in the light of a commodity. In my opinion unrest and uncertainty comes from this very attitude. This is wrong in principle and wrong in practice. Industrial effort had one aim—the making of money instead of the making of men. The supply and demand theory is one which is oppressive. It is not a theory to be upheld. It is wrong; it is not christian; the case of the factories proves this; for the workers might even be expected to pray that the factory next door would explode.

A man who dabbles in stocks is another illustration. If he prays at all, he prays that stocks will be short in order that he may make his millions on the stock he holds.

It would be advantageous to bring the whole business of the fisheries into one monopoly. I do not mean that the fisheries should be held as one big trust by one man. There is a control which a government can have over our fishery produce which would be a power for good to the country.

In connection with Hon. Mr. MacNamara's figures stating that one-quarter of a million quintals of fish unsold were now in stock—my information is, we have one hundred and fifty thousand qtls. only, and that the balance, left after selling to the Brazilian market, is to be sent to Mediterranean ports between now and end of July and sold at not at all ruinous prices. On question of losses I cannot positively speak but there is another feature, and it gives rise to the question: how much we would have lost if regulations had not been put in force?

Moreover, these Fishery Regulations were fully discussed in the Board of Trade, and I think the Hon. Mr. Grieve voted on that occasion, for a resolution which began: Fish Regulations are essential.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—Mr. President, it was my intention to have made a reply to Hon. Mr. Grieve. I prefer not to do so in his absence. I beg to move that meantime the 2nd reading be deferred.

I should like to know whose estimate Mr. MacNamara quoted in acknowledg-

ing loss last year to the extent of $3,000,000.

HON. MR. MacNAMARA:—I have no definite figures to prove statement but thought that such was generally admitted.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—By no means are they generally admitted.

HON. MR. SHEA:—In reply to Hon. Mr. Browning's question I may say information is being sought. I hope to be able to give in a few days the statement from the Militia Department which he requires.

HON. PRESIDENT read communication from His Excellency the Governor naming Internal Economy Commission: Hon. President Legislative Council, Hons. Mr. Bishop, Mr. Shea, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Squires, Mr. Warren and Mr. Coaker.

The following bills were read for the first time:

A bill for "An Act to amend the Industrial Societies."

A bill for "An Act to amend the Food Control Act of 1917."

A bill for "An Act respecting the Department of Public Works."

HON. MR. SHEA tabled Annual Report of Reid Newfoundland Company.

On motion the House adjourned until to-morrow Friday at 4.30 of the clock.

FRIDAY, April 30th, 1920.

The House met at 4.30 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

HON. MR. MILLEY gave notice of petition from W.P.A.

Order of the Day.

(1) Address in Reply.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—Mr. President, the Speech before us, being the first pronouncement of their Policy by a new Administration, has been receiving in the House of Assembly attention such as we know is usually accorded the Government in this country upon its first meeting in legislative session. It is eulogised by the speakers on behalf of the Government and condemned utterly by the Opposition. It was not to be expected of course, that a unanimously favourable opinion would be expressed by hon. members in this chamber and it occasioned no surprise that a portion of the Speech of His Excellency the Governor at the opening of this Session has been criticised adversely.

It must however be exceedingly gratifying to the Hon. Mr. Shea, the leader for the Government, that up to the present at least, criticism has been confined to one paragraph only of the Speech—a Speech which refers to many matters of public moment, all of which are highly important and indicating various contemplated changes, the aim and object of which are the advancement of our country, the improvement of her economic resources, the permanent enhancement of the value of her products, and the extension and improvement of facilities for more rapid and more convenient handling of her commerce—local and foreign—among all of which it will not be denied that the industry which employs the majority of our producing class, and without which all other industries in this country would be non existent—stands *first* and *paramount*.

Now, Mr. President, it is not my intention to weary the Council by reviewing in "extenso" the whole of the Speech, but I regard it, Sir, a duty to myself, to this branch of the Legislature, and to my country, to voice my sentiments respecting matters which I believe to be not only important but at the present juncture vital.

In the month of November last two contending parties presented themselves to the Electorate of this country —one, the party led by Sir Michael P. Cashin, which had for some time previous been in control—the other led by Mr. R. A. Squires. The sentiment of

the country was found to be adverse to the late Government and Mr. Squires and his followers were returned with a very substantial majority. Now Sir, whatever may be said of the merits of the opposing parties, as such, I submit the result of the bye election in St. John's West, which was one of the most persistently vigorous contests ever witnessed in this country, left no room for doubt as to the sentiment of the country. The Hon. R. A. Squires was confirmed in his position as Prime Minister of Newfoundland, and the country being now faced with post war conditions, the duties which devolve upon him and his Government are numerous, extensive and onerous, and as I view the situation it is therefore the duty, not only of those who by their recorded votes placed the Government in power to support them fully, but it is the duty of all good citizens, all patriotic sons of Newfoundland, not to continue showing factious opposition, but to assist in removing obstacles rather than to place obstruction in the way of the Prime Minister and his Government. Surely we must realise that it is incumbent upon us, no matter what our politics may be, to recognise the supreme right of majority rule.

The programme of the Government then for the coming year is before us for deliberate consideration and fair comment.

I should like Sir to take a minute or two to commend the action of the Government in relation to the purchase of a portion of the battlefield at Beaumont Hamel. It is the portion of France which will remain for all time and hold chief place, in the memory of Newfoundlanders, as the gallant deeds of the Royal Newfoundland Regiment are recalled. It has been my privilege to be on two occasions upon that sacred ground. Exactly three weeks after the memorable 1st of July, 1916, I traversed the trenches of the British Army upon the Beaumont Hamel field, proceeding through the communication trenches and thence from the rear to the front line trench and reaching a point where from a concealed machine gun emplacement I had a close view of the ground over which our boys had gone with such heroic courage in the early morning of July first and though depletion of their numbers commenced when they had proceeded but a comparatively few yards, and despite the rifle fire from the front trenches of the Germans but three to four hundred yards distant were subject also to enfilading fire from two batteries of machine guns which quickly thinned their ranks but they never faltered nor flinched. The bodies of many of our splendid boys, among them my own nephew, were still lying strewn over that portion of no man's land when I looked upon it, and their recovery and burial could not be attempted. As a lively artillery duel was in progress before we had reached the front line trench and falling shells were frequent, the Captain sent from Divisional Headquarters to accompany me, having a mistaken notion that a legislator was of more value than a soldier, urged our return to a safer region and was particularly urgent when we had reached the front trench and officers there also endeavoured to persuade me that it was a very unhealthy spot, and they insisted I should upon no account get on the firing step and look over the parapet.

Disregard of their warnings that hundreds of German snipers with their rifles pointed towards us in that trench were waiting and watching for the least sign of movement, brought an appeal to me to consider the responsibility upon the officer in whose charge I had been placed. I said I had come a long way to visit *that* ground and until I had seen it from the nearest point of vant-

age I would not return. A Major or Colonel then said, "But Sir, *Military* rule controls here," to which I replied "I know it, but my escort was ordered by the highest authority to take me as far as I wish to go and I'll take my chances." I wouldn't exchange the experience of that afternoon—when with a steel helmet on and a gas-mask hanging from my neck—I experienced something of warfare at close quarters for any other experience or any money that could be offered me. That poor young Captain though said he was glad when we had got out of the danger zone and if there were to be any more such visitors he would like to be assigned to other duties. Such was my first experience at Beaumont Hamel and it afforded me great satisfaction as I felt how heroic have been our boys against such odds as they had faced on that field.

Well, in August last I was again upon that hallowed ground in company with Rev. Major Nangle, and I assume the area purchased embraces the cemetery which we then visited and in which so many of our boys are resting, though unfortunately the contests for possession of that area subsequent to July 1916 prevented recovery and burial of a great many of our fallen men. It should be regarded a privilege to support the suggestion of the Hon. Mr. Coaker by contributing a dollar towards a popular subscription to cover the cost of that field, which was, taken and retaken during the war.

While the difficulties of the work undertaken by Major Nangle is now generally known I cannot refrain from saying again that my tour with him of the battlefields of France and Flanders, over which our Regiment fought, convinced me of the fitness of the selection of Major Nangle for the onerous work he has so cheerfully undertaken, which he and will, I am sure, perform to the entire satisfaction of the Government and of our people.

I am glad to notice in the Speech intended changes in matters pertaining to the Departments of Agriculture, and of Marine and Fisheries. That the changes contemplated will prove to be improvements in large measure, I have no doubt.

Now, Mr. President, it is evident that the paragraph of the Speech around which the greatest interest centres is that relating to the Fisheries.

There has been a great deal of interest, real or pretended, manifested in respect to the regulations for the export of codfish proclaimed shortly after the assumption of office by the present Government. Indeed, it seems as if it would have been a lean season editorially,—for certain newspapers, if the editors had not had this subject to hash and rehash day by day for several months past.

I was greatly interested in the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Grieve, respecting these "Fishery Regulations." Mr. Grieve is an out and out opponent of the measure, and Mr. Grieve's long experiences as a fish merchant and exporter entitles him to full latitude in the expression of his opinions. Other prominent exporters, notably Sir John Crosbie, condemns only the fixing of selling prices, but affirms emphatically his belief that the standardisation of quality and competent, impartial inspection is absolutely necessary. Others again support the opinion of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that both quality and price should be regulated and controlled.

Now Sir, in all the writings and all the orating upon this subject we have had little but generalities such as $3,000,000 have been lost, etc., without a tittle of evidence in support of it. I was glad to hear my friend, the Hon. Mr. Grieve, disavow any political animus or influence, in his attack upon

the "Regulations," but Sir, I feel bound to say that Mr. Grieve is in bad company and that the Opposition newspapers are making full use of the attitude of Mr. Grieve. I notice Hon. Mr. Grieve gives the Minister of Marine and Fisheries credit for a sincere desire to benefit the people of this country, and that his action respecting the enforcement of Regulations was the result of such desire. Mr. Coaker will I am sure appreciate Mr. Grieve's candour.

It must appear to those unacquainted with the ramifications of the export of codfish that a splendid opportunity for exporting the past year's catch with good profit has been lost through the imposition of these fish exporting regulations. It may be correct, Sir, to say that a certain shipper, at a particular time, could have marketed a cargo at a satisfactory price, but even that, I submit, Sir, is doubtful, for what might be obtained from a buyer who could operate without regard to restrictions, might not, and probably would not be paid by him if the restrictions which induced the offer were suddenly withdrawn.

Now Sir, I wish to interrogate respecting some of the assertions of the Hon. Mr. Grieve.

Has there been *no* profits made upon cargoes shipped since Regulations were enforced? Are the losses upon the shipments of codfish since November last where losses occurred, solely and entirely attributable to the "Regulations," and apart altogether from those restrictions let me ask, were not the market conditions decidedly unfavourable during recent months? Does Mr. Grieve wish this House to infer that had there been no "Regulations" enforced and he and every other buyer had had a free hand to sell how, when, and at what price they pleased, it would have been quite safe for him to have purchased 40/50 thousand qtls. of codfish last fall and that he could have been sure of marketing it at a profit? Does he say that a free hand for everybody, at all times, and under all and any conditions is the proper course to follow? Mr. Grieve complains too that cargoes sold under the Hawes argreement have not been paid for in full at the price agreed, but are the "Regulations" responsible for that? Most certainly not, but because of lack of care in shipping, or more probably careless or insufficient curing, the fish was found when it reached its destination to be not of the quality or grade the buyer had a right to expect, and consequently the shippers' agent in fairness to the buyer conceded a reduction; that Sir is the cause of short remittances, and is that a reason for crying "abolish all restrictions?"

I would say also Sir that ascertained losses as far as I know are very greatly *below* the figures mentioned by the Hon. Mr. Grieve, are not in fact one tenth of $3,000,000. If $3,000,000 have been lost it means an average loss to shippers of about $150,000 and as some shippers have met no losses and I hope B. Johnston & Co. are not one of these it becomes evident that some firms and not a few either must be subjected to a financial strain which they cannot possibly withstand.

It must be noted also Sir that Mr. Monroe's cable message, about which a great deal is attempted to be made, does not say the restrictions from the first have been a failure, but that in his opinion, an opinion Sir, affected possibly by contact with men who from the first have ridiculed the attempt of the Government to regulate sales—the conditions *now*, not last fall, but the conditions which exist to-day are such as to make it desirable that any holder of codfish should be free to market it as he can. The cablegram does not I submit Sir warrant the interpretation that

'tical football of. I never knew any measure in this country that was not made a political football of, each side trying to belittle the efforts of the other, but I disclaim on my own behalf any political motive in opposing these regulations. I do it simply as an exporting merchant with an experience of fifty years and with a knowledge extending to sixty. It is only my opinion. I give it for what it is worth. The future will show whether I am right or wrong. In my opinion, there is a dark cloud hanging over this country now. We have had them before and they have been dissipated. This may be dissipated, and no one would be more glad than I would be if this disappeared. In my opinion, we have not yet come to the consequences; the consequences will come in the fall of the year, when the people employed in catching the principal article of produce of the country will find it very difficult to get purchasers. The first requisite for successful business is confidence, and if you destroy confidence you handicap trade. Reference has been made to the Italian Consorzio. The Consorzio was an association appointed by the Italian Government and had the monopoly of buying and selling all the fish in Italy. One of the promises held out by the Hon. Mr. Coaker was that by the means he was establishing we would be able to do without the assistance of the Consorzio but would be able to get better terms, that instead of selling our fish and being paid at a much lesser rate than we contracted for, we would receive payment to the extent of one hundred per cent. That is not true. When I say "not true" I am not attributing to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries any bad faith, but the promise then made has not been realized. There are five or ten cargoes of fish that have been paid to the full extent. Some have been paid 80%, in other words the hopes held out to us have not been realized. Arrangements were made by which a sale of all the cod fish exported to Europe could be brought about. The portion which could be sent was proposed by cable. A party was formed. I was told that if I became one of its members I should be put on the ground floor. I was to benefit specially though outsiders would suffer. This difficulty, merchants from this country have had to contend with for many years. We should have agents in different markets to superintend the landing and adjustment of the cargoes. The late Government made an effort in that direction and the present Government is following it up. It would be greatly to our advantage to have men residing at the different ports. In answer to Mr. Browning's question—'In what way could harm come in standing firm on export prices?'—There would be no harm—It is much more difficult to name prices to receive in foreign countries combining one another than for local supplies.

HON. MR. SHEA:—I hope I said nothing in my remarks to which exception could be taken. With regard to these regulations I never meant in any way to make a charge against you in the political aspect. Nothing was further from my thoughts.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—Section II of the Address of His Excellency the Governor refers to the ratification of the Peace Treaty. I am sure we all join with His Excellency in hoping that peace throughout the world will long continue. Section III of Speech from the Throne refers to the gift of two ships from the British Government. These ships will be welcome. They are badly needed just now, and will be a great asset to the country. In reference to Section V—the standard and price of fish must be kept up. If the price of fish and other products are not

is being placed on it, in fact it clearly and distinctly shows the contrary.

There is nothing new, Sir, in finding market conditions unfavourable and losses accruing to shippers of codfish. A statement by Sir John Crosbie at the Board of Trade meeting in February may be remembered. Sir John said his experience had been that he always had a chance to make some profit upon fish, which he shipped before the end of the year, but upon stocks of fish in store at the commencement of the following year there were invariably losses met. This had no relation to restrictions of price or destination, but that *always* there were losses upon stocks of codfish, carried into the following year. This is the opinion of Sir John Crosbie and relates to years in which no restrictions existed.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to make it clear that this is not the first season that attempts have been made to regulate the marketing of our fish by agreement, and I do not think Mr. Grieve was always averse to such attempts. I go farther and give it as my opinion that had Mr. Grieve been in St. John's last Fall when the Hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries called in for consultation certain members of the trade, that he Mr. Grieve would not be to-day condemning restrictions totally for there cannot be a doubt, I think, that Mr. Grieve would have been one of the first whom Mr. Coaker would have sought conference with, and Mr. Grieve beyond doubt would have been of great assistance to the Minister in working out some acceptable plan of operations.

Through a misunderstanding no doubt, the Hon. Mr. Grieve denied that he had been a member of a Committee appointed for control of prices and shipments of codfish. In the Fall of 1918 the Hon. J. C. Crosbie, Minister of Shipping, the late Hon. John Harvey, and Mr. Grieve formed a committee for that purpose. It will probably be said that that was a voluntary act by the fish exporters, but its chairman was a cabinet member—the Minister of Shipping,—its meetings were held in his public office and the majority at least of the exporters of St. John's and of Conception Bay believed the other members, Messrs. Harvey and Grieve, to be advisers only and not appointed as principals who were being merely assisted by Sir John Crosbie. It was thought *that* Committee could do much and I believe it really did much to regulate matters pertaining to shipments, but the object underlying that and other agreements, Sir, was to maintain by combination greater stability of prices and regularity of shipments. It was an acknowledgment of the principle of "unity of action" and the same chance for all in an effort to secure the best results and prevent undue depreciation of our products.

The Hon. the leader of the Government, Mr. Shea, in his address at a former sitting—an address upon which I wish to compliment him,—very correctly described the newspaper opposition to the Government restrictions as party prejudice greatly detrimental to the interest of fishermen and merchants alike.

The causes affecting present marketing conditions are various, chief of which, however, is the poverty of the great fish consuming countries of Europe, whose currency is so reduced in value that it is impossible for them to purchase freely any kind of imported food. Another difficulty of shippers arises from the impossibility hitherto of obtaining even approximately correct information respecting the catch or stock of fish in our own country, a condition which I hope the present Government will at once take steps to rectify. Lack of correct information respecting our catch has always been a handicap upon exporters. With

knowledge of the catch by the Marine and Fisheries Department passed on weekly to the Board of Trade, and shipments from outports also telegraphed promptly, the trade would be greatly helped and the whole country benefited.

The conditions in Portugal at present are admittedly bad and losses in some cases serious, will be met. Those conditions have not resulted through Government restrictions but from internal causes; and are not holders of Brazil fish asking and expecting higher prices for their stocks still held. The position is not cheering I admit but we have more than once seen it much worse.

I hope the Government will ask the co-operation of the Board of Trade in deciding upon standards of cure and cull and arrange for the strict enforcement of such rules as may be decided upon. This is not merely desirable but is absolutely essential if we are to maintain preference for our chief product in any of the markets of fish consuming countries. If Hon. Mr. Coaker has been correctly reported it is his intention to ask the co-operation of the Board of Trade.

Reference to the Hawes Agreement should in my opinion find no place in this discussion, but I may say that as far as I know I was the first to refuse to be a party to the Hawes Agreement, and I am therefore the more free to speak. There may or there may not be a Hawes Agreement the coming season, and if there are objectionable conditions attached to it at present they may possibly be remedied.

The stocks of codfish unmarketed certainly afford cause for some anxiety whether it has been shipped abroad or is still held in store in this country, but the situation is not helped by blaming the Government or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, or by continuing controversy over the merits or demerits of the Hawes Agreement, which did not restrict me or Mr. Grieve or anybody else from shipping our fish to any country except Italy and that restriction may be removed by the time this year's fish is ready for marketing. As I remarked before, we have had to face adverse conditions in fish markets periodically, and shall again meet them. Let us not, however, foolishly decide that we have become incapable, or that the country's resources are permanently impaired; let us rather manfully face the conditions confronting us, not sectionally, but "unitedly" and remember that not local conditions only but present *world* conditions *demand* harmony and co-operation between merchant and merchant, between city and outports, between government and people, and an earnest desire and resolve upon the part of us all to work *"pro bono publico"*—and take to heart words recently uttered by Mr. Lloyd George and which are as applicable in this country as in Great Britain—"THE TIMES ARE TOO SERIOUS FOR PARTY CONFLICT."

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—It might naturally have been expected that I should have replied to the speech of Hon. Mr. Bishop who has devoted so much of his argument to me personally. I regret that a very large portion of his speech was inaudible to me as the hon. gentleman was facing the chair. He has taken the precaution deliberately to commit in typed characters the remarks he has delivered to this chamber, and I should like at leisure to study those remarks and to reply to them in a deliberate manner because my remarks shall go on record either for woe or for weal of this country and I should like to plan those remarks supported so far as I can by argument.

I should like to refer here to one matter which has nothing to do with the question under discussion, namely the Escasoni cargo last year. The cir-

cumstances were as follows; and do not come within the scope of the present Speech from the Throne. This was a large cargo of codfish, some 60,000 quintals which it was very difficult to realize upon. The exporters met, and Hon. Sir John Crosbie, Hon. John Harvey, A. E. Hickman and myself were appointed a committee to take charge of and dispose of this cargo. The only authority we exercised in that connection was in regard to the Greek market to which the vessel was consigned . With regard to other markets we had nothing to do. But we took this in hand and we managed to realize it, with assistance, in a market that was unknown to us, and the proceeds were not paid for except in the shape of bonds of three years duration, which I hope at maturity will be met. Had we not done so and that option not been taken the value of that cargo, probably worth a million and a half would have been lost.

That however has no connection with this matter. The Hon. Mr. Shea in course of his remarks asked me to be more specific. I intend to get together some figures in support of my contention in reference to the losses. Between two and three million dollars have been lost. This loss is mainly to be attributed to the institution of these regulations. I hope very shortly to supply Hon. Mr. Shea with some of the figures he asked for. I hope also to reply to Hon. Mr. Bishop in deliberate form. One cannot on the spur of the moment, without preparation, speak on a weighty matter such as this. As far then as those sections of the speech are concerned I defer what I have to say. Mr. Bishop alleged that we debated only one section . I do not know that it is incumbent for every member to speak. This is not like another chamber but a deliberative body to correct hasty decisions, but not on strict party lines as elsewhere. I think I am correct in saying that the desire of all of us is to contribute something to the welfare of the Dominion and not to be splitting straws. I hope at the next meeting of the House to be in a position to state satisfactorily what my opinions are. These regulations are calculated to do grave harm. I agree with Mr. Monroe. In February he indorsed the regulations as far as Europe was concerned, but not with regard to Brazilian market. When he went across he saw the harm of these regulations—changed ideas on making enquiries into the matter. If what may be called supplying in the country is restricted I may deduce from that that they have insufficient confidence in the country's ability to market the produce of the country. There is mistrust of the future—to some extent this is due to the regulations regarding export of codfish and the throwing overboard of the law of supply and demand. There are a hundred thousand quintals in Portugal to-day and the price is low when there were four or five thousand quintals last year and the price was higher. That meant poor supply last year and good supply this year. This is the same principle.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—There is just one point only on which the Hon. Mr. Grieve and myself disagree. I am prepared to admit we have to act with the greatest caution. He avers that present conditions are to be traced entirely to the promulgation of the regulations last Fall with regard to sale prices. We agree to disagree. I do not think they can be traced even in a small way to this cause. With regard to the Escasoni it has nothing to do with the question at issue. I refer to this as an instance where attempts have been made from time to time by exporters of St. John's to arrange a combine to protect themselves. Conditions demand the serious attention of all persons connected with trade. Instead of

crying blue ruin we should unite to keep up the trade not only for ourselves but for those who come after us, who have to be supported by the cultivation of this country.

HON. MR. WINTER:—I wish to say a few wprds in reference to remarks made by Hon. Mr. Bishop re a statement of Sir John Crosbie's made in the Board of Trade rooms last February. A great deal of discussion took place, and a great deal of public interest was shown. It was resolved that the Advisory Committee would call a meeting in the Board of Trade and ask the members to meet there and discuss the merits or demerits of the regulations. The meetings were held for three days and the whole situation debated on. Hon. Mr. Grieve was present. I do not know whether he took part in discussion or not. However the result of the debate was this: that the meeting unanimously agreed that the regulations were essential. Resolutions were passed by vote. In my opinion there is not the slightest doubt that these regulations were necessary and I have sufficient experience to be able to form this opinion. Just at this time I have gone out of the fish business. My principal reason for doing so was that there were no regulations. I found the result of our shipments from Labrador was unsatisfactory, some years we made a little money, other years we did not. Had the shipments been regulated we should have always made money. Some years we were able to make sales, sometimes in Greece, Italy and Spain. Then the Spanish merchants found out it would be safe not to buy till vessels arrived in Gibraltar. Sometimes twelve, fifteen or eighteen cargoes arrived from Labrador at the same time. The buyers in Spain and Italy would then buy what they liked or reject it altogether. This seriously affected price. If we all work together there is no difficulty in putting the price on fish.

The Spanish and Italians state themselves that they do not mind the price they give for the fish if we can guarantee no one here will sell lower. We agreed often to hold our fish for a certain price but agreements were always broken. When once the foreigners see us weakening they take advantage of it. Experienced men must know that there are some business people in Italy and Spain who will do the right thing and treat customers fairly, others are notoriously dishonest. Cargoes have been condemned as bad fish and been refused if no allowance is made. It used to be so. It is better now as our agents now in some ports help the shippers out. Price and shipments should be regulated.

The Hon. Mr. Bishop made some remarks in refence to the statement of the Hon. John Crosbie re result of shipment of past years. I do not know if he were right or not but I had the same impression. I understood that shipments made after a certain date were sold at a loss. His experience was (if I am correct) if he had a voyage of a hundred thousand quintals of fish and sold sixty and had forty remaining, it would pay him to sell the balance at cost. That is what I understood. That goes to show the necessity for fish regulations. If there were regulations he could not possibly undersell like this. If he lowers the price others must suffer.

I think it is a mistake when making regulations not to invite all interested in the trade. It is unfortunate all did not attend meeting to discuss this matter. We should not have the opposition we have to-day if such had been the case. For those who were not asked to take part naturally resent them. I understand that in future it is proposed that the regulations will be in charge of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries

and he will have an Advisory Board to consult as to best regulations to be made. I cannot see any objection to this being adopted by the Government. Members on Board will be those interested in the country, and most of them large shippers themselves. The more people consulted the better. Regulations obnoxious last Fall or now might be altered.

In reference to enormous losses owing to regulations I am glad the Hon. Mr. Grieve is going to give us figures. My own opinion is the loss of two or three million due to regulations is a gross exaggeration. It could not happen to shippers here without making them stagger. I see no difference in Water Street to-day. It is nothing new to make heavy losses.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—It is generally admitted that the stock is abnormally large. We have approximately in Portugal ninety thousand quintals of fish, in Spain one hundred thousand, in Italy, (which has sent back cargoes), about one hundred thousand, twenty or thirty thousand in Greece. I venture to say that the loss will amount to amount $5 a quintal to the shippers, these stocks run so very largely. There is in stock in this Colony between two hundred and three hundred thousand qtls., valued at $11 or $12 per quintal. That fish cannot be sold in St. John's for eleven or twelve dollars. If these are calculated I figure a loss amounting to two or three million dollars must accrue.

HON. MR. WINTER:—We want more evidence than that there is going to be such severe losses. I am not convinced that these losses are entailed by the regulations. In Portugal the loss is not on account of regulations but on account of fish being rotten. I do not blame fish regulations for that. This should not be considered in figuring up losses. The honourable gentleman will admit the loss on good fish will not be very large and that when he ships it over to Spain it will pay him a good profit.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—Sometimes.

HON. MR. WINTER:—Nearly always. I am very pleased to know that my honourable friend has made so much money out of fish.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—I am reported to have lost this year two hundred thousand dollars.

HON. MR. WINTER:—But you cannot believe reports. If we believed all the stuff that is printed in the papers now we would be very much misinformed. I must apologize, Mr. President, for taking up so much time of the House, but this subject of the fish regulations is a very important one. I do not think we could discuss a matter of more importance to the country than this. I must say it seems to me that we cannot overlook the fact that the first people to form an opinion as to whether the regulations are good or not are those that have experience in shipping and those who have been in the foreign market and know what the trouble is. Now the Honourable the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has spent a very considerable time travelling in Europe, in Italy and in Spain and Portugal. He has been over there and he knows exactly what the trouble is over there, what it is due to, whether it is due to the quality of the fish or that the market has been overstocked. He has got all the particulars, and I think that with his practical knowledge and being a large shipper largely interested in the business of the country, together with practically the whole of Water Street assisting the operations, I think we ought to be able to make some very sensible regulations which will be of advantage to the country.

HON. MR. SHEA:—Mr. President, I beg to move the second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the effect and application of certain acts sub-

sequent to Consolidated Statutes (Third Series). This Bill comes from the Minister of Justice and refers to a purely legal matter. It refers to the effect of the application of certain Acts subsequent to the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland. These are Acts passed since the Consolidation took place in 1916. It is a purely legal matter and has been sent to us by the Minister of Justice. I beg to move the second reading.

Second reading of bill "An Act respecting the effect and application of certain acts subsequent to Consolidated Statutes (Third Series)."

Referred to Committee of House on to-morrow.

HON. MR. SHEA:—Mr. President, I beg to move the second reading of this bill entitled "An Act to amend the Industrial Societies Act, 1919." This refers to what is a change of words more than anything else. The effect is to change the word "Registrar" to "Minister of Justice." It was considered unexpedient that the Registrar should have the framing of laws affecting the Societies, and that the matter ought to be handled by the Minister of Justice. This bill also comes from the Minister of Justice. I beg to move its second reading.

Second reading of Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Industrial Societies Act, 1919."

Referred to Committee of House on to-morrow.

HON. MR. SHEA:—Bill entitled "An Act to amend Cap. 41 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Newfoundland Medical Board.'" I beg to move the second reading of that Bill. The Bill is in reference to the Medical Board and has the effect of changing the fee for admission. When a gentleman comes here to practice and wants to get a permit from the Medical Board, instead of paying $25.00 as formerly he will under this Act have to pay $40.00. The Medical Board considered the fee of $25.00 was too small to meet expenses. I beg to move the second reading of this Bill.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—I want to ask the honourable gentleman whether this has anything to do with the matter of the high cost of living. I presume it has not, but wished to make quite certain that it was not a matter of profiteering.

HON. MR. SHEA:—It has no bearing on the high cost of living.

Second reading of Bill entitled "An Act to amend Cap. 41 of the Consolidated Statutes (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Newfoundland Medical Board.'"

Referred to Committe of House on to-morrow.

HON. MR. SHEA:—Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Food Control Act, 1917," I beg to move the second reading of that Bill. The Food Control Board under the Act of 1917 consists of only three members. It has been considered necessary to increase that number and this Bill will make it possible to increase it to six if necessary. At present the Board consists of five and this Act is to allow the number to be increased to six instead of three. I beg to move the second reading.

Second reading of Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Food Control Act, 1917."

Referred to Committee of House on to-morrow.

HON. MR. SHEA:—A Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Department of Public Works."

I would ask that the further consideration of this Bill be deferred.

HON. THE PRESIDENT:—I have to-day received a communication of thanks from the family of the late Hon. John Harvey which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read the communication.

The House adjourned until 4.30 Monday, May 3rd, 1920.

MONDAY, May 3rd.

Hon. S. Milley read petition from the Women's Patriotic Association re Act of Incorporation and said: "As this Bill will come before the House later on, it is not my intention to say anything at present except that I am entirely in accord with the granting of this petition. I beg to move that the petition be received.

House went into Committee on the several Bills, entitled an Act respecting the application and effect of certain acts subsequent to the Consolidated Statutes, 3rd series; an Act to Amend Chap. 41 Consolidated Statutes, 3rd series, entitled, Of the Newfoundland Medical Board; and an Act to Amend the Industrial Societies Act, 1919, which were passed without amendment, and on motion of Hon. Mr. Shea ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

House went into Committee on the Act to Amend the Food Control Act 1917, Hon. Mr. Browning in the chair.

HON. MR. MEWS:—As a member of the Food Board I have a few remarks to offer. I might say that the original section reads as follows: (read section). Under ordinary circumstances, therefore, the Act would cease six months after the declaration of peace, which date would be somewhere in June, but as it was eminently desirable that the Food Board should remain in existence as there were several pressing matters that it was necessary some department should look after, the Government have substituted this paragraph, and when the Food Board is to go out of existence, it will be proclaimed to due course. In taking up this matter of food control one of the first things that strikes one is the fact that Newfoundland is dependent for her supplies, on outside countries. Almost everything we have to export in large quantities, even potatoes, which anyone would naturally suppose would be produced in sufficient quantities here to feed us. But we find to-day it is costing $14.00 to bring potatoes in here and owing to a very great shortage most people will have to pay that. The Food Board is in rather a difficult position, between two fires, if I might put it that way, with the business community on one side and the people on the other. The business people generally, as some of the operations show, are perhaps no better than any other ordinary human being. For instance we find in the case of sugar some business men asking if we are not going to commandeer all the sugar coming in this month, five or six thousand barrels. Of course that demand generally comes from people who have not been farseeing enough to provide themselves with sugar, but the stand the Food Board takes is that so long as that sugar is coming in and getting into proper distribution, there is no necessity for interfering. To take over a lot of sugar like that is no easy matter, when we consider that it is not only to be distributed along Water Street, but throughout the country. We have plenty of sugar coming in, I think about 6,000 barrels, this month, which will accommodate present needs both in the city and outports.

There is one thing I should like to say in this connection, and that is, that it would help immeasurably if everyone, not only those who can afford to buy a barrel, but those buying from week to week, if they would resolve not to buy any more than enough for immediate needs. This is one of the causes that raises prices more than any ordinary individual

would think, and the fact of the people rushing after barrels and quantities as soon as it is put into store is bound to result in a shortage of supplies.

Another matter is that of re-selling "up-a-long" that which is bought for home consumption. I was told that one could get double the profit on the goods coming in if sold in Canada without touching it at all, but I am glad to say that that business man who told me that turned the offer down, as he did not think it fair to the country, to the trade, to the Government or to his fellowmen.

In that connection I should like expression of opinion from honourable members in business. It does not seem to be playing fair for a commodity which we absolutely need to be put out of our reach, especially when it at present is hard to replace —very hard to replace. On the other side we have the people who are now in a state of uncertainty and unrest, which often to my mind is alarming. They feel what is happening—the high cost of things. I can understand this. I can't buy lots of things I could. I have to do without many things. In that way I can feel for the people who are endeavouring week by week to make ends meet. I know among some classes wages have increased, but there is another class commonly called the salaried class, whose salaries by no means measure up to requirements. These cannot live as they would like. The demand of the people is not unreasonable in many cases. There are of course a lot of people who make money and waste it. That is true, but there are lots of others who cannot possibly remain outside the circle of unrest. Personally I should like to see a Consumers' League formed, people through that agency will be able to enquire for information about business—an advantage which they ordinarily would not have. They have grievances now. In some cases they have to pay high prices (which do not necessarily mean high profits). These difficulties are caused through lack of contact between business men and people, which the league may get over. People complain of high prices and blame the Food Board, but this league will give them opportunities to voice their complaints through an organization, and complaints will be investigated. Consumers' League can do a great deal with regard to demand. If it can influence demand or the nof buying freely of the necessaries of life this will go a long way towards lowering prices. The Food Board is generally conceived to be a police department going round everywhere and finding what profits are being made, but we have no machinery to do that sort of work. We investigate more in bulk rather than in individual cases. We have to take over practically whole supplies before we can attempt to fix prices. I am very glad to be able to announce it is very likely the Government will introduce a profiteering Act along lines similar to the English Act, so that the individual can lodge complaints. This act will be altogether separate from the Food Board Act. I had the pleasure the other day of being censured for lowering prices in one commodity, in a store on Water Street and saved some people several thousand dollars. We can stand a great deal of that.

One of the great difficulties to business people mostly is defining what profiteering is. Most of the stores in Newfoundland carry everything from a needle to an anchor, as the saying is, and if exorbitant profits are being made on needles we are told that money is being lost on anchors. They are working under the system that

the price of an article is set by the price which they have to pay in order to replace it. That is the business axiom. I have an article here which speaks of this. It is what I have been wondering about myself in cases of that nature—when a man is making a whole lot of money on sugar but losing on fish. In New York lately a dealer bought sugar at 16½ cents per lb. and sold it for 21¾ cents. He was selling at market rule, but he was hauled up before Court. He was obeying a rule and instinct of business operation. How far is that axiom to be taken, how far is it to be discounted? There must be a sort of average to take, as to how much a man has made during five years by following the market and how much he has lost. However there will be another opportunity to go into this matter when the Profiteering Act comes up. I expect it will be debated with vigour in this chamber. The whole problem should be settled by co-operation—co-operation between business men and the people. Antagonism on either side is injurious. I simply ask, if I may, that trade would submit to work more openly, more in harmony and take cognizance of the people's share in it. This would undoubtedly bring about a better state of affairs. Hon Mr. Bishop concluded his speech with a quotation from Lloyd George, "Times are too serious for party conflict." It may also be said that times are too serious for unjust profits.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a few observations on the bill before the House; to increase the membership of the Board of Food Control or in other words a Board to regulate prices and to keep down the high cost of living. Mr. Chairman, I know of no bill, or any act of Parilament in any country that has been passed during recent years, that has assisted in reducing the high cost of living more than the Daylight Saving bill. During the past week some clever writers to the press have been writing against the measure, without giving a single reason. Such contributions are only fit for the waste paper basket. I observed during the week an editorial reference to the daylight and changing of the clock as the summer game of make believe. Life is too short to answer the many silly arguments used against more daylight. The best argument in favour of the Daylight Saving Bill is—the whole world has adopted it by Acts of Parliament, with the exception of the United States and Canada. I regret to say, politics and personal interests dominate these two countries in the world wide question of saving daylight. In the case of the United States without an Act, practically three-quarters of the population are now enjoying the blessings of a long evening in that great and glorious country. Common sense prevails among the populace of the United States, they are tired listening to farmers and tht extra hour of pay between six o'clock and seven each evening during the summer time. The farmers of the United States are now backed by directors and shareholders of electrical and gas undertakings. What I have said of the United States equally applies to the Dominion of Canada. Independent of the Government, about three-quarters of the people will enjoy during the summer one hour of extra sunshine. The members of the House of Commons and senate sitting at Ottawa, and the members of the farmer labor legislature of Ontario at Toronto, while admittedly opposed to daylight saving, find themselves compelled to work by it on account of local conditions.

When the British Government appointed a commission to enquire into the operation of the Daylight Saving

Bill for 1916, after taking evidence throughout the British Isles, they unhesitatingly said that the vast preponderance of opinion throughout Great Britain is enthusiastically in favour of summer time and of its renewal, not only as a war measure, but as a permanent institution. Such was in part the report of a Committee to enquire into its operation. Wherever the Act has been passed it has contributed in many ways to a reduction on the high cost of living.

Now Mr. Chairman, in looking over the Revenue and Expenditure for the following years, I find the Government have been making very decent profits from the people of this Dominion, through the Custom House. You can call it overtaxed if you like, caused by high values on goods imported from the United States, Canada, or Great Britain, on the basis of high advalorem duties, varying from twenty to fifty per cent.:

	1913	1914	1915	1916	1917	1918	1919	1920
Flour	$ 5.60	$ 6.00	$ 7.20	$ 8.00	$14.30	$14.70	$14.00	$16.00
Pork	26.25	28.00	20.25	29.50	43.50	43.00	60.00	54.00
Beef	19.00	20.00	19.00	21.00	33.00	46.00	33.00	30.00
Sugar, per lb.	3¼	7	6	8¾	.10½	.10	.10½	.20
Molasses, gal.	.37	.26	.37	.40	.53	.94	.95	2.00
Bran, bag	2.00	1.60	1.60	2.00	2.55	3.30	3.50	3.80
Hay, ton	23.00	26.00	23.00	26.00	25.00	33.00	46.00	60.00
Oats, per bag of 4 bushels	2.60	2.80	2.80	3.20	5.20	5.40	5.30	6.40
Feed, bag	1.80	1.70	2.20	3.80	4.00	4.50	4.50	4.80

Above are all average cost prices

1915-16.

Revenue	$4,600,272
Expenditure	4,110,885
Profit	489,387
	$4,600,272

1916-17.

Revenue	$5,206,648
Expenditure	4,554,891
Profit	651,757
	$5,206,648

1917-18

Revenue	$6,540,083
Expenditure	5,369,455
Profit	1,170,628
	$6,540,083

1918-19.

Revenue	$9,550,000
Expenditure	6,850,000
Profit	2,700,000
	$9,550,000

Total Revenue in 4 years $25,897,000
Total Expenditure in 4 years 20,885,231

Government profit in four years paid through the Custom House, (Five million dollars) $5,000,000.

While the high cost of living has risen, no effort of any kind has been made to reduce the tariff. I admit the task would be a difficult one, the markets both at home and abroad are constantly going up—with the result great unrest prevails in all parts of the globe. Unrest on account of the high cost of living.

Unrest at home! The workingman is looking for better social conditions for his family—unrest among the

workers for higher wages. General unrest throughout the country among our young men. The spirit of roving has entrapped many of our finest youth—they cannot settle down to real life. There are few injunctions more needful at the moment than that which reminds us that we are living in a world in which supplies are not equal to the demand, and that there has not yet been an adequate effort on the part of peoples of the world to make good the wastage. I earnestly beseech every young man, and thoughtful men of age, to settle down to a real life of industry and become a producer of his country. High prices, after all, are only one of the manifestations of a freak economic situation, and all our energies must be bent towards the righting of that situation.

I have carefully gone into the question of flour, beef, sugar, molasses, bran, hay, oats, feed, etc., with my Hon. friend Mr. McNamara, who is in this business. From these figures you will observe the steady increase in prices from 1913 to 1920. Whether these goods are sold retail or wholesale, in both cases the merchants follow the market. All the goods mentioned here pay a specific duty, and does not in any way effect the cost, either at a high or low cost in price.

At the present time, I understand, there is a falling market, and considerable losses will be made in general provisions, particularly beef.

Mr. Chairman, with regard to the high cost of living, and its cure, for the information of this House and the country—I will quote a few articles, their cost in 1914 and the present cost in 1920:

March, 1914, blue serge that cost 5|6 Stg.; March, 1920, cost 25|—.

March, 1914, blue serge that cost 6|6 Stg.; March, 1920, cost 28|—.

March, 1914, blue serge that cost 7|3 Stg.; March, 1920, cost 30|—.

Tweeds for men's suits have risen in the same proportion. It makes no difference whether these goods come from the United Kingdom, United States or the Dominion of Canada—they all pay the same duty, 38½ per cent advelorum. We have no deferential or preferential tariff.

Tweeds that cost in 1914 6|— per yard to-day are costing 22|— per yard; 6|6 are 23|—; goods that could be bought in 1914 for 7|— to-day are invoiced at 28|— per yard.

Common linings used in the tailoring trade that cost in 1914 1|9 are now costing 5|6 per yard.

Linen htread that cost 5|10 in 1914 is now invoiced at 24|— per lb.

Black silk twist in 1914 cost 22|— is now 72|— Stg. per lb.

Common black wools that were bought in 1914 at 6|6 and 8|6 per spindle are now 50|6—higher prices have advanced to 75|— and 85|— per spindle.

Cotton goods, bed tick, sheetings are from 300 to 500 per cent higher than they were previous to the war.

The same applies to Boots and Shoes. Take the case of a certain kind of men's boots that in 1914 the price was $3.00; 1915, $3.40; 1916, $4.00; 1917, $5.00; 1918, $5.50; 1919, $8.35; 1920, $9.50.

Women's boots that were sold in 1914 for $1.80 are to-day $6.00 per pair.

The above prices are F.O.B. New York or Boston. The same advalorum duty of 44 per cent is paid to-day on the high cost of goods as the trade paid on the low priced goods of 1914.

In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, the most important section of the speech of His Excellency, delivered in this House a few days ago, is that relating to the estimates. These will be subject to considerable revision, and that

a bona fide statement of moneys, necessary to carry on the Government of this country will be laid before the House. In addition to this the Minister of Finance will prepare careful estimate of taxation that will be required to meet expenditure. The Minister can rest assured to meet the obligations of the civil service of the Dominion, and the increase of debts incurred by the great war, he will have the endorsation of the country. To avoid undue taxation, and unnecessary taxation the Minister of Finance will of goods, paying an advalorem duty. require to exercise great care, on account of the high price of all classes In the case of wool, the duty has increased about ten times. Cotton goods from pre-war cost shows an increase of six times; boots and shoes, five times. There is much scope for the Minister of Finance to show his great ability in his first budget, so that his estimates are thoughfully and carefully prepared, having due regard that ample provision is made to meet the expenditure, that the people and trade and commerce of the country are not overtaxed. I am not aware of any justification why the Government of this country should show a surplus of over two million and a half dollars, if the high cost of living is to be reduced.

Mr. Chairman, the greatest drain upon the man of salary or any householder is his coal account. Coal is being sold to-day at $19.00 per ton. Lately the quality seems to be dirt and dross, with a few lumps of coal thrown in. I hope to refer to this important question later, but a united effort must be made to reduce coal to at least $13.00 or $14.00 per ton by the co-operation of the Government, Bell Island Ore Co., Dominion Coal Company, and our local Union of Longshoremen to give quick dispatch to iron ore carrying steamers. The price of coal sold in St. John in 1913 was $7.20 per ton; 1914, $7.60 per ton; 1915, $10.80 per ton; 1916, $11.00 per ton; 1917, $15.00 per ton, and later in the year $16.00 per ton; 1918, $16.00 per ton; 1919, $15.00 per ton; 1920, $15.00 per ton, in the month of February $17.50; May, $18.50, and on Saturday last $19.40 per ton. The duty paid on coal 70c. per ton and 10% surtax; on a barrel of flour 27½ cts.; hay per ton of 2000 lbs. $3.30; Indian Corn Meal 22c. pbl.; Salted beef and pigs jowls $1.10 per bl., pigs jowls and tongues $1.65 per brl., pork $1.65 per brl., family mess pork $2.20 per barrel.

Sugars—loaf and cut loaf 3cts. lb. and 10%; granulated sugar 1½ cents per lb. and 10% surtax. The rise and fall in the market of the above articles in no way effect the Customs tariff.

The bill before the House to increase the members of the Food Control Board, has my support, and co-operation to reduce, or find if possible a solution of the high cost of living. In numbers there is always a glimmer of hope. On the completion of the full board, we hope to see the dawn of a new era, a promise for the future. What we want, Mr. Chairman, is a settlement of the great unrest. This city cannot afford any more strikes; I am a great believer in settling all disputes by arbitration. Common sense applied will cement a good feeling between capital and labour. Many labourers in this city have given it as their opinion that the only way to ease the high cost of living is to improve our housing, and bring the dollar back to its original value, is to increase production—and this is a real step toward that increase.

Mr. Chairman, we must not leave the reduction of the high cost of living to the coming manhood. We must be reasonable, the laborer is worthy of his hire, he must have a living wage, but unreasonable demands for higher wages with no greater production of

earnest work, prices go higher, freights go up, the whole machinery of the country's trade is put out of gear; there is still much to be done, all sections of our industrial workers have yet to see the light of this new dawn. When employer and worker are co-operating to the mutual benefit of both, and through that to the benefit of the country.

We must use our best efforts to settle for some years, by some agreement, the great social question of unrest. I hope the time is not far away when all unions will have met their employers and settle this vexed question of wages, and by their united effort bring back the standard of the dollar to its old purchasing power, and not leave the problem of the high cost of living to the future manhood of the Dominion.

Coal—Since this year came in it started at $15.00, then went to $17.50, $18.50; some time ago it was sold for $19.40, and now, I understand, the price is $19.00. Soft coal pays a duty of seventy cents a ton and 10% surtax. I have not yet got into the secrets of the trade as to the amount that is paid for coal F. O. B. North Sydney, but I cannot understand why the people are being charged $19.00 a ton for coal unless they are paying an extraordinary freight, away beyond what they are entitled to pay. In 1913 the freight from Sydney to St. John's was $1.20; in 1915 it rose to $4.50. What it is at the present time I am not in a position to know, but this I do know, that whatever the price at Sydney, the wages paid the men in 1913 was 17c. an hour, and now they are paid at the rate of 55c. an hour, and that the discharging of coal in St. John's was 40 c. a ton, and now, I understand, it is 90c. The point I want to make, Mr. Chairman, is that we ought to get the steamers coming to Bell Island for ore to bring coal to us. I believe that an effort was made some time ago, but the trouble was that the steamers could not be discharged quickly enough. Now if some arrangement could be made to get these steamers coming from Sydney to bring a cargo of coal and get immediate despatch at a reasonable freight, the coal could be very much lowered in price, and I hope the Minister of Shipping will make an effort to get some coal, a most important thing for the people of this city, at a low or reasonable price, much below the present quotation.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad today that I am in a position to put before this House for the benefit of the honorable gentlemen who may not be familiar with the facts, some statistics with regard to the high cost of living. Some of the honourable gentlemen may be aware of these facts, but it will be at least valuable information for the people of this country, and I hope that the reporters will be careful to take down every word of what I am saying. It is in connection with the cost of living in the United Kingdom. It is a comparative statement of the percentage rise in the cost of living in the United Kingdom and in foreign countries and has been issued as a parliamentary paper. From the figures that I have submitted to this House and from the information that I have from Canada, I find that there is very little difference between the high cost of living in Canada and Newfoundland and the United Kingdom. This is a parliamentary document issued last April—I think it is April 20th. In the United Kingdom the cots of living has advanced 130 per cent.; in Paris, 197 per cent.; other French towns, 220 per cent.; Rome, 193 per cent.; Milan, 282 per cent.; United States, 96 per cent.; Belgium, 296 per cent.; Denmark, 142 per cent.; Norway, 201 per cent.; Sweden, 159 per cent.; Germany, 356 per

cent. From the figures I have submitted to the House today on the high cost of living and with a little care, I have estimated that in the Dominion of Newfoundland the cost has increased 120 to 150 per cent.

HON. MR. MEWS:—Since when?

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—Pre-war days, and that in the Dominion of Canada—I have taken the figures from "The Montreal Star" and I believe they are correct—the increase has been about the same as in Newfoundland.

As to profiteering, the greatest profiteer of the country was the late Government. I will show you why. The revenue for 1915-1916 amounted to $4,690,272, and the expenditure to $4,110,000. They increased their credit balance by $489,000. In 1916-17 the revenue was $5,206,648 and the expenditure $4,554,891, and they increased their credit balance by $651,-757, higher than the previous year. In 1917-18 the revenue amounted to $6,540,083 and the expenditure $5,369,-455. The surplus at the end of that year amounted to $1,170,628, or an increase on the previous year of $518,871. I have no figures for 1919-20 yet, as I do not presume the accounts are yet ready, but there is a revenue of $9,550,000 against an expenditure of $6,850,00, showing a surplus of $2,700,000, credit balance, or profit if you like; politicians call it surplus.

Now I do not discredit in any way whatever the Minister of Finance for showing such a large surplus. If you take the four years from 1915 to 1918 and put the total revenue together, they amount to $25,000,000 in round figures, and if you put the expenditure together it would amount to $20,000,-000 in round figures, or, in other words, during the four years the surplus would amount to $5,000,000. I am not blaming the Minister of Finance, because, having an ad valorem duty as we have, when goods that have increased in price to the amount of 500 or 600% are imported, they bring up the revenue, and it would not matter who the Minister of Finance was, whether this sheet of paper were the Minister, the result would be the same.

Now the point I want to seriously impress upon your minds is this, that if the Government wishes to grapple with the problem of the high cost of living it must consider the goods that come into this country that pay a large amount of duty. And, further, I want to know from the Minister of Agriculture and Mines what are the proposals that he is going to put before the farmers. He must insist upon the farmers growing more turnips, more potatoes—because I understand potatoes would be one of the most profitable commodities the farmer would have to sell now, and I hope that the introduction of the Daylight Saving Bill will, as one of my friends suggested, make the hens lay more eggs—one can never tell what effect it may have. And my honorable friend will tell the farmers that they must mind business and mind it well, and increase last year's produce by at least 100%. That is one of the best ways in which the high cost of living can be reduced—greater production, full value for increased wages, and still greater production.

Now there is one other little matter upon which I must detain the House. Section 8 in His Excellency's Speech says:

"The revenue for the last fiscal "year showed a substantial surplus "over expenditure. On the other "hand, there have been large expen-"ditures not included within the scope "of last year's Estimates which it "will be necessary to legalise. In "spite of these large disbursements "the revenue was more than sufficient to meet current expenditure. It

"must be remembered, however, that "practically the whole of the very "large expense incurred in connection "with the Department of Militia and "in the matter of pensions for soldi-"ers and sailors and their hospital "treatment and civil re-establishment "was borne on Capital Account."

Whether that means, Mr. Chairman, that the surplus that I have just mentioned will go to meet these obligations, I cannot tell. I have heard it stated in the Lower House that when all the debts of the war were put together the cost of the war would likely be about $30,000,000, which amount we hope will be paid by Germany. Well, I am afraid we will not get it in a great hurry, but I think that the $5,000,000 should have been applied to reduce taxation, and while in a crisis we are willing to do our best, there are future generations coming after us and whether we should pay for what debt is incurred now is another matter. But, Sir, I believe we should consolidate all our debts and make full provision for our interest charges, and reduce if possible our national debt. The Speech goes on:

"The Estimates have been subject "to considerable revision, and have "been based upon the report of the "Civil Service Commission appointed "by my late Ministers. My Ministers "propose to submit to you for your "careful consideration a bona fide "statement of the moneys which are "estimated to be necessary to cover "the expense of the public service of "the Colony for the coming fiscal "year."

Now, that is a statement, a clear-cut statement of a debit on the one side and an estimate of what they are likely to get on the other. I am not now going into the question of estimate and expenditure. It will be gone into carefully and very thoroughly.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have never on the floors of this House mentioned the name of the Hon. Mr. Coaker. I have been acquainted with him ever since he started in a humble way, and I tell you, Mr. Chairman, that if the policy that he has outlined of trying to get the best price for the commodities of this country is carried out, he will deserve the best thanks and gratitude of the country for the interest he has taken and the trouble he has taken to do so. There never was a time when the people of Newfoundland required the best price for their commodities than now. I am not going into the question of herring or salmon or other exports, but I wish briefly to draw the attention of the House to the price of lobsters since 1913. In 1913 the price was $22.50; in 1914, $15.00; in 1915, $12.50; in 1916, $16.50. Now in 1914 the great market for lobsters, a market which we have since lost, was Hamburg.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—Was it not Russia?

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—Well, Russia too, but more particularly Hamburg in 1914. Hamburg was then paying a very high price for lobsters. Now I hope we will develop a big trade with the United States. The highest price paid since 1913 was $36.50, in 1919, and I am told that the price will drop in 1920, and that we will probably be getting $25.00. I hope this is not true and that we will get a bigger price.

I was in hopes that before taking my seat I would be able to review the prices paid for fish from 1913 to 1919, and thep rice that is being paid for it now, but I have only succeeded in getting the prices at which it is valued at the Customs House, but presume there is very little difference. The value in 1913-14 was $6.50, 1914-15, $6.75; 1915-16, $7.25; 1916-17, $8.25; 1917-18, $10.40; 1918-19, $14.50.

Mr. Chairman, when the Bill in relation to Fish Regulations comes before this House I hope the regulations will be of such a nature that they will meet with the approval of those at least who are immediately identified with the trade and who have a great interest in keeping up the value of our exports. If the Hon. Mr. Coaker does this, he will, as I have said before, have done a marvellous piece of work in the interests of the country.

Mr. Chairman, I support the bill before you now, and impress upon the Government and upon the Food Control oard the importance of using an extraordinary effort to keep down, whenever possible, the price of the commodities that must be consumed by the people, and to keep down the price of coal and always have sufficient in the market to supply the demand.

On motion the Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment. The report having been received the Bill was ordered to be read a third time on tomorrow.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Shea the remainder of the order paper was deferred until tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Shea tabled Report of Schools under Church of England Boards and Report of Schools under Methodist Boards; also papers in connection with the Treaty of Peace between Allied and Associated Forces and Germany and other papers relating thereto.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Shea the House adjourned until Wednesday the 5th inst., at 4.30 o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, May 5th, 1920.

The House met at 4.30 pursuant to adjournment.

These Bills were read a third time and passed:

Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Effect and Application of Certain Acts subsequent to the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland."

Bill entitled "An Act to amend 'The Industrial Societies Act, 1919'."

Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 41 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland entitled 'Of the Newfoundland Medical Board'."

It was ordered that a message be sent to the House of Assembly informing that body that this House had passed same without amendment.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—Before the passing of this Bill I wish to make a few observations along lines similar to those which I followed a day or so ago.

As far as sugar is concerned there seems to be a feeling abroad that the price is likely to be high. Now, Sir, I wish to inform this House, and through it hte people, that it won't go to the price feared. Those connected with its importation, I have no doubt, will be able to keep the price down to a reasonable extent. In view of the wide interest being displayed at the present time in the sugar situa tion, a recent report from Cuba on the sugar crop in that country, prepared by H. A. Chisholm, Trade Commissioner at Havana is interesting.

He says it is predicted that the value of this year's sugar crop may reach a total that will almost equal, if not surpass, the value of the last three years' crops put together. If sugar continues at the present high rate of between 12 and 13 cents a pound, f.o.b. Cuba for crude, this year's estimated production of 4,200,000 tons will be worth in the neighbourhood of $4,200,-000,000. Of course, it is impossible and unsafe to predict just what the sugar market will do, but, taking the low estimate of 10 cents a pound as the average price, Cuba will get for this season's crop the value of her sugar will be $940,800,000 on an estimate of $4,200,000 tons. In 1919, total value of the crop was $471,269,445; in

1916, $324,937,179 and in 1917 $322,-368,576.

Referring to the export situation, he says that an interesting feature of Cuba's exports in the last three years has been phenomenal increase in the amount exported direct to Canada. In 1917 Canada took 3,515 tons, 1918 12,090 tons and in 1919 the statistics show as above that Cuba exported 81,996 tons direct to Canada. There are loading in Cuba at the present time 9 steamships for St. John, N.B., Halifax and Montreal, and three more are on their way. These are to discharge at Halifax. Large quantities of Cuban raw sugar are to be brought to St. John, Halifax and Montreal during the next few weeks. There are at present nine large cargo carriers loading sugar at Cuban ports, three other vessels with sugar are on their way to Canadian ports, and still another has reached Halifax, bringing the Canadian sugar fleet up to thirteen vessels. All the vessels are operated by the Canadian Government. The list includes:

The "Canadian Adventurer" unloading at Halifax.

The "Canadian Sailor" taking cargo at Jucaro and Cienfuegos.

The"Canadian Trader" loading at Palo Alto;

The "J. T. Drummond," loading at Havana;

The "Sheba" and "Canadian Sower" loading at Havana;

The "J. A. McKee" at Guay Abel.

This fleet will bring to St. John. Halifax and Montreal a total of more than fifty thousand tons, the greater part probably going to Montreal. The employees of the Montreal refineries threatened to strike unless wages were advanced, and if the plants are forced to close some of the Montreal sugar may be diverted here. It is understood that several thousand tons of raw sugar will be refined here for United States interests. Refined sugar in that country is higher than it is in Canada, and the big rush of raw sugar to Canadian ports is a movement to keep the price of sugar from going to twenty three cents in Canada. It is felt that a great trade movement between Canada and the West Indies is at present only in its initial stages, and will grow in time to immense proportions. The Royal Mail Steam Packet "Chignecto" is due in St. John to-day and it is probable she is bringing considerable sugar.

There is one other matter I wish to speak of before sitting down. It is the coal question. I am sure my honorable friend the Leader of the Government will exercise his full power to relieve the coal situation. I had occasion today to make application for some coal, and could obtain but half a ton and that dirt and dross. We have been and are now sending ore from Bell Island. I hope the Government will arrange a reciprocal trade through that company. If we supply ore on which is only paid 7½c. per ton duty, they ought at least keep us in coal at a reasonable price. The city needs about seventy thousand tons to meet requirements, and this and other necessities should be obtained through these lines, and not alone that, but get whatever is required for the people at a reasonable price, more especially in the case of coal, one of the greatest necessities that the people of this country require during the winter season. We cannot do without coal, and I am sure the Government will impress upon the Dominion Company this great necessity and the interest that should be taken to get coal. A reciprocal policy ought to be adopted between the Government and the Dominion Iron and Steel Company and the Coal Company—for what we are giving you, you have to give us something in return, or you have to do

something in return. And if we can succeed in bringing coal down from $18.00 or $20.00 a ton to $12.00 or $15.00 a ton—and there is no reason why we should not do it—we have done a great deal for the country. I understand that once before the war coal was supplied to a corporation in this town for about $1.25 a ton.

Well, it has gone up by leaps and bounds, until now coal cannot be bought in Sydney for less than $6.00 or $7.00, whether screen coal or from the mouth, I do not know. But why we should pay $20.00 a ton for coal, paying a duty of 70c. and freight and other charges to the amount of $13.00, goes beyond my comprehension. There must be something wrong somewhere, and an effort must be made to right that wrong. Today some of the stuff that is being sold to the people for coal is nothing but dust, and ought not to fetch more than fifty cents or a dollar a ton. I understand that a local company is making an effort to mine coal in Newfoundland, and I hope the Government will give them all the encouragement and assistance and support they believe they desire.

I think, Mr. President, that prices have gone up so much since 1913, not through any fault of the importers of the country, but entirely because of the manufacturers abroad. The fact that the prices of raw wool, raw cotton and other raw materials have gone up is the reason why prices are so high.

Now there is one other matter, Mr. President, and that is the question of potatoes. Members of the House of Assembly have expressed their regret that the Minister of Agriculture and Mines was not in their Chamber, but I can assure him we are glad to have him here. I understand that the next arrival of potatoes will be $14.00 a barrel, and that local potatoes are being sold at $11.00 a barrel. We made a great hue-and-cry during the war for allotments and encouraged the people, both of St. John's and the outports, to grow more vegetables. Well, the need today is stronger than ever it was, and I hope my honorable friend will make things hum agriculturally and give every encouragement to the people to grow more vegetables than in the past. It is in the interests of the Government and the country to keep down if we can the prices of the articles of daily food for the people. Clothing I need not refer to again. They have their Overall Brigade in many American and Canadian cities. We have not yet arrived at that stage in St. John's, but if we do I am sure some of us will look very well indeed. I can assure you so far as clothing is concerned, the percentage of profit is no bigger than in the pre-war period, and things have gone up much more in the Old Country than in St. John's.

There is a factory in this town which ever since it has started business has given the trade an excellent quality of underclothing, and when the trade gets an opportunity I am quite sure it is a pleasure to them to buy from that local factory. This factory is unable to supply the trade now because of the great difficulty in securing raw materials.

Then there is sugar. We have been promised within the last few days that sugar will be 28c. a pound, and I think that the Government and the Food Control Board ought to do something and make every effort to get a quantity of the sugar which is now being refined in Canada, so that we may if possible keep down the price of this much-needed article of food.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea 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.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Shea the remainder of the Order Paper was deferred.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea the House adjourned until Thursday, the 6th instant, at 12.15 p.m.

THURSDAY, May 6th, 1920.

The House met pursuant to adjournment.

At half-past twelve o'clock the Council proceeded to Government House with the Address in Reply to the Speech of His Excellency the Governor.

At twenty minutes to one o'clock the House having returned, the Honourable the President reported that His Excellency had been pleased to receive the said Address and return an answer thereto in the following words:—

Government House,
St. John's, Newfoundland,
6th May, 1920.

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.

C. ALEXANDER HARRIS,
Governor.

On motion of the Honourable Mr. Shea, ordered:—That the consideration of the Order of the Day be deferred till to-morrow.

On motion made the House adjourned until Monday, the 10th inst., at 4.30 p.m.

MONDAY, May 10th.

The House met at 4.30 pursuant to adjournment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea the Bill "An Act respecting the Department of Public Works" was deferred.

Hon. the President informed the House that he had received messages from the Assembly acquainting the House that they had passed the following Bills in which they requested the concurrence of the Council, viz: An Act to amend Chapter 176 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled "Of the Encouragement of Shipbuilding"; An Act Respecting the Department of Posts and Telegraphs; an Act to Provide for the Standardization of Codfish; an Act to provide for the better obtaining of Information respecting the Cod Fishery; an Act to incorporate the Women's Patriotic Association of Newfoundland; an Act to amend Chapter 11 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled "Of the Department of Marine and Fisheries."

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Shea these Bills were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—Mr. President, before the motion for adjournment is put I rise to ask your permission to make a personal statement. In the course of the debate on the address I made reference to the visit of certain people to Port Union and the subsequent promulgation of proclamations following quickly afterwards, and I drew the conclusion that these visits had something to do with the proclamation. In this connection I was challenged by Mr. Job, one of the gentlemen whose names I mentioned, and he has written to me the following letter, which I propose to read with my reply thereto. I do not propose to debate the matter, but in justice to Mr. Job place his view of what did take place before the general public, and will read the correspondence without making any comment.

(Copy) May 7th, 1920.

Hon. W. B. Grieve,
City.

Dear Mr. Grieve,

I notice that during your eloquent speech in the Legislative Council a few days ago (with very little of

which I can agree), you did more than insinuate that the much discussed Regulations were originated and put in force as the result of a visit by myself and Mr. Hawes to Port Union. I have no wish to deprive Mr. Coaker of the credit of having made this, at least partially successful effort to substitute sanity for insanity in the conduct of the country's business, and therefore write to state that during the first visit to Port Union, to which you refer, there was no discussion or suggestion as to the enforcement of these or any other Regulations. Mr. Hawes went there in connection with his own business with the Union Trading Company or Export Co., and hearing that he was going I volunteered to accompany him, purely as a matter of interest, to see the Company's premises.

The Regulations were neither suggested nor inspired by either myself or Mr. Hawes now did we know that it would be practicable to put such Regulations into force. Mr. Coaker framed the Proclamation himself, presumably with assistance from some of his colleagues, and when they were definitely decided on and not before, he asked the assistance of myself and Mr. Hawes on his Advisory Board. The scond visit to Port Union was made at the request of Mr. Coaker himself, several days after the issue of the Proclamation, in order to assist him in framing some plans for carrying out the object aimed at.

I am quite in accord with the view, that the Trade generally should hav been more fully represented on the Advisory Board. but that was a matter over which neither myself nor Mr. Hawes had any control.

I did in this case, exactly what you did when the late Government was in power, viz: agreed to assist them when requested to do so, for the benefit of the whole trade, and I don't think I shall ever regret having done my best in this matter, thankless though the task may have been.

I feel sure you will have the decency to correct your statement.

Yours very truly,

(Signed) ROBERT B. JOB.

I wrote back that same day to Mr. Job:

May 7th, 1920.

Robert B. Job, Esq.,
City.

Dear Mr. Job:

I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of this day's date. In my speech in the Legislative Council I referred to your two visits to Port Union, accompanied by Mr. Hawes; and I note that you disclaim having discussed fishery regulations on your first visit and that on your subsequenet visit to Port Union you went there "to see the Company's premises," and at the request of Mr. Coaker. My deductions must therefore have been erroneous; and I shall, on Monday, when the Council resumes ask permission to make a statement in explanation.

The question of your sanity or insanity and mine need not be discussed. What I am alarmed at is what will be the mental condition of the people of this country later on arising out of these restrictive regulations?

The plan of campaign adopted in the case of the "Escasoni' cargo is not exactly as you state it. Sir John Crosbie as owner of the steamship "Escasoni" sat as Chairman of a Committee selected by the Board of Trade at a general meeting of that body called for the purpose.

I take exception not so much to the limit placed upon Trade representation on the Advisory Board as to a statement made to the Government that the majority of the exporters approved of such restrictive measures.

Yours very truly,
W. B. GRIEVE.

This is followed by another letter from Mr. Job in which he says:
[COPY.]

May 7th, 1920.

"Many thanks for your letter, from which I judge that you have mis-read mine, in which I stated that I accompanied Mr. Hawes to Port Union on the first visit purely as a matter of interest and "to see the premises.' If you will re-read my letter you will see that your reply shows that you have mis-read it.

With regard to the third paragraph of your letter, I did not refer to the case of the **"Escasoni"** cargo but simply to your position on the Board of the Ministry of Shipping in a general way. In the case o fthe **"Escasoni"** cargo no doubt all the shippers were consulted—in many other cases the rest of the trade, outside of the Advisory Board, were not consulted. I think you did your duty on the Shipping Board to the best of your ability, and for the common welfare, which is exactly what I attempted to do on Mr. Coaker's Alvisory Board.

Yours very truly,"

I do not propose to comment upon these letters, but in justice to Mr. Job I put his views on record, and they will go to the country to be interpreted by the country.

The House then adjourned.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Shea the House adjourned until to-morrow at 4.30 o'clock.

TUESDAY, May 11, 1920.

The House met at 4.30, pursuant to adjournment.

Hon. Mr. Shea moved the second reading of the Bill respecting the Department of Public Works and said the object of this Bill is to change the number of members from four to six, as owing to the increased work in that department, this has been found necessary.

The said Bill was read a second time and ordered to be Committeed on tomorrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea the second reading of the Encouragement of Shipbuilding Bill and the Department of aMrine and Fisheries Bill was deferred until tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Shea moved the second reading of the Bill respecting the Department of Posts and Telegraphs and said this Bill has for its object the establishment of a new department, that of Posts and Telegraphs, and it abolishes the office of Post Master General, and places the control ofthe Post Office and all its workings under an executive head, who will be a member of the Executive Government and of the Legislature. It has been found that this department has grown so much of late years as to necessitate its removal as a sub-department of the Colonial Secretary, and it is hoped this will make for the better working of the department.

The Bill was thereupon read a second time and ordered to be Committed on tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Shea moved the second reading of the "Standardization or Codfish Bill," and said: "This bill provides for the appointment of a Committee with regard to the Standardization of Codfish. When we go into Committee, I shall go into details, but that is the purpose of the Bill, placing the standardization of codfish under a government Control Board."

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

Hon. Mr. Shea moved the second reading of the bill respecting "The Better Obtaining of Information Respecting the Codfishery, and said:—This bill is really self-explanatory, providing for the better obtaining of

Information regarding the fishery generally, and calls for no further explanation. Said bill was thereupon read a second time and ordered to be Committed on to-morrow.

HON. MR. MILLEY moved the second reading of the Bill re Incorporation of the Women's Patriotic Association of Newfoundland, and said:

HON MR. MILLEY—In moving the second reading of this Bill it is not necessary for me to occupy very much of your time, the work of the Women's Patriotic Association is well known to every member in this Council.

Organized shortly after the outbreak of the War, this Association has, with untiring zeal, done a marvellous work in the interest of "Our Boys" who went overseas to fight for King and Country. Now that the war is over, people are beginning to realize what is owed to the Women of our Empire, for their great, glorious and self-sacrificing labours. I have been informed that, since the operations of this Association commenced, no less than one hundred and fifty thousand dollars were collected and distributed through them. The reports published from year to year, as well as the information given frequently by the daily press, are matters of common knowledge.

It was feared a short time ago by some of us that the close of the War would see the close also of the Women's Patriotic Association, it is therefore a particular pleasure to me to ask this Legislature to assent to a Bill which has for its object the incorporation of this organization with a view to continue, along other channels, the good work thus begun.

I need only call the attention of the Honourable gentlemen present to the names attached to the petition, presented by me last week, to show that this new movement augers well for the carrying out of high and noble aims in the interest of the people of this country.

I have much pleasure in moving the second reading.

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

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea, the House then adjourned until Friday next at 4.30 o'clock.

FRIDAY, May 14th.

The House met at 4.30 pursuant to adjournment.

The House went into Committee of the Whole on the following Bills:

"An Act respecting the Department of Public Works."

Hon. Mr. Winter in the Chair.

Committee passed Bill with an amendment. Bill to be read a third time on Monday.

"An Act respecting the Department of Posts and Telegraphs."

Hon. Mr. Mews in the Chair.

In introductory speech it was stated that the Department of Postmaster-General was to be changed to Ministry of Postal Telegraphs.

Committee passed same with amendments. Bill to be read a third time on Monday.

House went into Committee on the Bill "An Act to Provide for the Standardization of Dried Codfish."

Hon. Mr. Cook in the Chair.

On motion the Committee rose. reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

House went into Committee on the Bill "An Act to Provide for the Better Obtaining of Information Respecting the Codfishery."

Hon. Mr. Steer in the Chair.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—In Section 3 I would suggest that we strike out the words 'Not less than $10.00.' I think the sentiment of this House ought to be against the imposition of minimum penalties. It may be found

that in some cases a penalty of less than $10.00 should be imposed, and while it is correct to say "Not less than $100.00" we ought to eliminate the minimum. We have in the section "Imprisonment not exceeding one month." If the principle holds good in one case it ought to hold good in the other. We have been strongly against minimum penalties for some time, and I think it will not deteriorate from the usefulness of the Bill in any particular.

Amendment carried.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—I certainly object to this paragraph altogether. Why should we be expected to report to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is engaged in the same business as ourselves? To give details of what exporters hold is wrong, if such information can be enjoyed by men in the export trade. It is unreasonable to suppose that the Minister or his Advisory Board will not take advantage of such information. Such legislation is un-British in my opinion, to make use of the private information of anyone. If I think money is to be made by a certain quality of fish, I back my opinion. Why should I hand over my opinions to the scrutiny of people engaged in the same business as myself, who will know what my stock of fish is, but I will not know what theirs is.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—While I sympathise to a certain extent with my hon. friend in the objections he raises to this section, nevertheless if we exclude it from the Act, the purpose and object of the Act would be defeated. One of the principal objects of the Bill I take it, is that it is absolutely necessary that the quantity and quality of fish should be known. Otherwise, how is the trade to be regulated? For instance, Brazil wants a certain quantity of fish suitable for that market; Portugal the same, and the other markets require certain quantities and each a different quality of fish. Except information of that character be given how can the export of fish to the different markets be regulated? It is necessary to find out if we have the quantity required on hand. Of course I recognize the position of the hon. gentleman that it is not altogether proper that a person holding the office of Minister of Marine and Fisheries should be engaged in the export of fish, but it is one of those conditions in this Colony that in almost every Department we have some gentleman filling office who may be engaged in the same trade or business as people who may have to go to him in his official capacity; but I know of no cases of suffering in the past, and do not think there will be any in the future. But I think it is necessary that this information be supplied in order that the export trade may be properly regulated.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—If you are going to do away with individual effort and enterprise, and destroy the adventure and courage and opinions of those who buy and export, this in my opinion will be the first step towards that. Speaking as an exporter it will be utterly impossible for me to fill my stores with fish on speculation, as I frequently have if I have to give information to a man in similar business, I can give a case in point: A few weeks ago I loaded a vessel for Brazil. There was an arbitrary price of 102/- and I had an open market for it. I applied for permission to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who does not export to Brazil, and he gave me permission and stated the language in which the application was to be couched, but when it was put to the Advisory Board next day I was denied it, and that cost me $30,000. The embargo placed upon my cargo by the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The Minister being in favor of giving me permission, but members of the Ad-

visory Board were in the same business and objected, and I was denied that facility. The same would happen under this section; they will take advantage of knowledge I may possess, and I will be seriously handicapped but if I know now beforehand what is going to take place, I must drop out, and I am preparing myself to do so. If I am going to be governed by people of little experience as to the mode and method I have to adopt in doing business, then I will have to drop out, and instead of having keen competition as beforehand, you will have people looking askance and prices will fall. We must not lose sight of the fact that our competitors are doubly and trebly outfitting for the fisheries. Great Britain has distributed 120 steam trawlers to her people and invading our ground, and if we have to compete with that and with Norway we are destroying the trade of the Colony. And not only the trade of the Colony, but every man who derives his livelihood from the proceeds of the fisheries. I say this is a most pernicious clause. It may be framed with the idea of benefitting the fisheries, but in my opinion it will cripple the enterprise and industry of the people who are carrying on business, and instead of sustainment of prices you will have lowering of prices. I say that clause ought not to pass, and if I find any sentiment in favor of the argument I put forward I will write out an amendment.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I would like to point out to the hon. gentleman in charge with regard to that section that while provision is made in sections one and two for reports from those who go to Labrador, Banks, Straits, or French Shore, as it is called, there is no provision that that information should be given out; but there is provision that stocks of fish held by licensed exporters should be published twice a month. Now is that by accident or design? If by design why is it that sum total of the fish from the Northern sections should not be given out as well as information of the licensed exporters? It seems to me that would be the best policy, to give the full catch on a given day, as the Noruwegians do. I presume it is an oversight. Apparently no fish is to be reported except fish in the hands of licensed exporters, and fish in the hands of the fishermen themselves, which at certain periods of the industry will be by far the greater proportion, is not to be publicly reported. Possibly it is intended to report the whole of it, and in that case the Bill will have to be amended.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—Now, Messrs. Monroe and Duder are recognized agents of firms in Brazil, and if they find the quantity of fish is large, they will simply sit down and wait for prices to fall. If they want only 150,000 quintals and there are 500,000 in the market, they will pass such information on to their principals, and the consequence will be the demand becomes small. When a merchant suffers, everybody suffers. The merchants will be sufferers by the fact that Brazil buyers will not come forward and purchase. Those in the know, however, will be able to market their fish, and those not in the know and not made acquainted with the details given in, will suffer. That does not inspire confidence; to know that a certain two or three will have prior information, and will be in a position to compete successfully with them. It is un-British. I could quite understand it if the Minister was not in the fish business, but he is an exporter, and the man who succeeds him may be also. If I was a member of the House of Assembly and got the appointment of Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I wonder what my opponents would say if I cleared out all my

stores and held no fish. I say the effect of such a clause as this will be to destroy confidence and diminish competition and to lower prices, and if hon. gentlemen can complacently look on the fact that the fisherman is going to catch fish with flour at $19, molasses at $2.00, salt $4.00 and other things in proportion, and only get half the value as indicated by the Minister and find themselves in debt at the end of the season, I do not think the country at the end of the year will be in a prosperous condition.

Last year in September Labrador fish came in and people looked at it in askance, and but for the firm of Lazo & Co., who stepped in and bought 10,000 quintals and gave the rest of the trade courage, it might have had a slump. If in the fall people have no confidence and are afraid to put fish in their stores, and the price is regulated by people of little experience or none and those who are assisting the Minister are in a position to makes sales from better knowledge of conditions than the rest of the trade possesses, then I think there is only one end to the fish business of this Colony. Hon. gentlemen are all interested in the general prosperity of the Colony and it is their duty to oppose this.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—Before Section five passes, it would appear to me that this paragraph cannot have received mature consideration in the Lower Hause, and I would like the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill to give us any information he can; but it does appear extraordinary that the Minister is to be furnished by every exporter not only with the total quantity of fish he holds in store, but with the qualities also. In other words he must say he has so much fish for Brazil, so much for Spain, so much Italian, etc. But the Minister shall not publish or allow any person whatsoever, except in legal process, to have access to any such report. What then is the value of that information to the Minister if he cannot impart such information to his Advisory Board? He is bound only to report to the President of the Board of Trade what is the sum total of the fish held by all importers. That information may be of some value, but only trifling value. The Minister demands he shall have full knowledge, but is bound not to divulge it. Well, I submit if that be the case and the Minister, being, as he is, a large exporter, can never be free of suspicion that he is making us give information which he is legally bound not to impart to any other exporter. If he could impart it even to his Advisory Board they would be at least in honor bound to treat fairly the information that comes to them; but according to that paragraph the Minister cannot impart to anybody. And what possible benefit can it be to him, or how can be use it? I would like an explanation if the hon. gentleman is in a position to make it.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—I think before the Bill is passed information should be given.

A MEMBER—By whom?

HON. MR. BISHOP—By the gentleman in charge of the Bill.

HON. MR. SHEA:—I shall be glad to afford the Honourable member the information required. I shall raise committee on it.

HON. SIR P.T. McGRATH—I object to the section on the ground that it practically stifles all criticism and comment on the catch of fish. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is to be furnished with a report of the catch. It is not stated whether he gives out this information or keeps it secret. He has only to furnish that information for the use of Trade generally. It is not public property. How are we to get a definition of

Trade generally? It may mean ten or a dozen big exporters or it may mean big fish dealers in some of the outports. Information should be given to the public officially. It should be gazetted, just as we get the total catch in Norway so ought the information regarding the total catch in Newfoundland be obtainable by our own people.

HON. MR. GRIEVE—Such information is the property of the Board of Trade and reports re catch of fish that come in, the general public become cognizant of. That is a convenient way of doing it. There is no intention to deny the public reliable information.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—The word 'wilfully' has already been used in Bill. With 'wilfully' excluded a man who publishes approximate statistics is liable to prosecution. I would suggest to honourable gentleman in charge of Bill to insert "wilfully." (Section 3, wilfully report incorrectly). This would prevent discussion.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—I ask Committee to rise and ask leave to sit again so that a conference may bring about a satisfactory clause.

Committee in charge of Bill entitled "An Act to provide for the better obtaining of Information respecting the Cod Fishery" reported it had made some progress and asked leave to sit again.

The House went into Committee of the Whole on the following Bill entitled "An Act to Incorporate the Women's Patriotic Trust Fund and for other purposes."

(Hon. Mr. Bell in the Chair.)

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I wish to call attention to honourable gentlemen in charge of Bill that this Trust provides that President shall be wife of Governor and Vice-Presidents—wife of Premier and wife of Chief Justice. There is no provision made for contingencies. These people may be non-existent. I suggest that Hon. gentleman in charge of Bill consult with these ladies and ask that provision be made for the filling of those positions in case of such.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—Ladies from the committee would be chosen.

Committee reported that Bill passed without amendment. Bill to be read a third time on Monday.

Second reading of Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 176 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled "Of the Encouragement of Shipbuilding," was deferred till Monday.

House adjourned till 4 p.m. Monday.

MONDAY, May 17th, 1920.

The House met at 4.00 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

On motion the Department of Public Works, Department of Posts and Telegraphs and the Women's Patriotic Trust Fund Bills were read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message that the Council had passed the same without amendment.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Shea the Standardization of Codfish and Codfishery Information Bills were deferred.

Shipbuilding Amendment Act.

Second reading of a Bill "An Act to amend Chapter 176 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled "Of the Encouragement of Shipbuilding'."

HON. MR. SHEA:—I beg to move the second reading of this Bill. The purport of the Bill is that the bounty on vessels shall only be paid on vessels of one hundred and fifty tons or less. This amendment to the Bill for the Encouragement of Shipbuilding passed in 1916 confines the bounty to be paid on vessels to vessels of one hundred and fifty tons or less, and provides for a rebate of duty on material used in the construction of cer-

tain vessels. These the the principal items in the Bill. I would ask that the Bill be allowed to go to second reading and that we discuss particulars when we go into Committee.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—Mr. President I desire to say just a word or two at this stage. I have always understood, Sir, that the Act relating to Shipbuilding and payment of bounty was an Act for the Encouragement of Shipbuilding. It seems to me that the Bill that is before the House for consideration is not a Bill for the Encouragement of Shipbuilding; at least that it is only so in part. The Bill, as I understand it, provides that no bounty shall be paid on a vessel that exceeds one hundred and fifty tons. I am unable to understand, Mr. President, why, if I build a vessel of one hundred and fifty tons and the vessel is built in accordance with the schedule laid down and obtains her class of "A" or "B" when surveyed by the proper authorities, I shall receive my bounty on my vessel of one hundred and fifty tons, while my next neighbor, say Mr. Winter here, for instance, who builds a vessel of two hundred or two hundred and fifty tons instead of one hundred and fifty, receives no bounty. I am unable to see why I do the country any more good by building a vessel of one hundred ond fifty tons than Mr. Winter or anybody else would by building a vessel of two hundred and fifty, and I claim that he is entitled to as much consideration from the Government as I am. If it be for any reason not yet stated that bounty on a vessel of more than one hundred and fifty tons should not be paid for the whole tonnage, surely in all fairness Mr. Winter is entitled to the same amount of bounty on one hundred and fifty tons of his ship as I am for the whole tonnage of my ship. It is apparent to everybody that we require vessels exceeding one hundred and fifty tons in the trade of Newfoundland, and why should we force everyone who requires a vessel of two hundred, two hundred and fifty, or three hundred tons for the purposes of Newfoundland trade to go to Nova Scotia or elsewhere and employ the shipyards and labor of that country and bring his ship into the country without rendering any returns to this country. By this Bill the man in this Colony who employs labor in Newfoundland and uses Newfoundland timber to build a ship larger than one hundred and fifty tons is penalized. It is true that he had been offered the trifling return of any duty that he may pay upon any material for such vessel, but I submit, Sir, it is entirely unfair and unreasonable that every man, no matter what size vessel he may desire to build shall not be entitled to receive bounty on at least one hundred and fifty tons of his ship. I am not saying that payment of bounty should be confined to that, because I think that any vessel that is built for purposes of trade and used in the trade should receive bounty. The rate of bounty, however, is another matter, and if the bounty that is being paid is more than the revenue can afford, then reduce the rate of bounty, but do not discriminate against one man, and, above all, do not force the trade of Newfoundland to go to Nova Scotia or elsewhere and employ foreign labor to build ships for our trade.

HON. MR. SHEA:—Mr. President, while my honourable friend says that the bounty was given for the purposes of the encouragement of shipbuilding, which is perfectly true, yet the Government is of the opinion that it has been demonstrated time and again that vessels larger than one hundred and fifty tons built of material obtained in Newfoundland are unsuitable for trade, and so limited the bounty to vessels that were considered generally of a suitable size for trading ships in the Colony. I quite see the

force of my honourable friend's argument that a vessel of two hundred and fifty tons should receive a pro rata bounty up to one hundred and fifty tons, but at the same time if these vessels are not suitable for purposes of trade, bounty should not be paid. I believe we have had the experience that large vessels built here have not been suitable, for the reason that the material that is got here is not suitable for large vessels, and the Government wanted to limit their liability for bounty to vessels of that class, and to encourage the building of vessels not larger than one hundred and fifty tons.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—Mr. President, I cannot help saying that the statement made by the Honourable the Leader of the Government cannot be supported by the testimony that we can produce, and I go further and say that it is a libel upon the builders of Newfoundland to say that they cannot product suitable ships larger than one hundred and fifty tons.

HON. MR. SHEA:—I am informed that the material for larger vessels, vessels of two hundred, two hundred and fifty, an dthree hundred tons, is very difficult to obtain here.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—There is at present in the harbor of St. John's a vessel of five hundred tons, built in Newfoundland, the "Sordello," and does anybody say that that vessel is made of material that is unfit or timber that is too small. Surely the surveyors, Lloyds' surveyor and the local surveyor, are not passing for bounty, vessels that are not fit. It is quite true that a number of our Newfoundland vessels have been lost on voyages during recent years, but the same is equally true of vessels built in Nova Scotia, and I could refer to more than one, more than two, more than three, that have been built within the past few years in Newfoundland that are as good as when they were built.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—May I ask the honourable gentleman what proportion of the total cost the bounty approximately represents?

HON. MR. BISHOP:—Ten per cent, but if the bounty is more than the Government feels it can affard to pay, (and that should not be because there are a very small number of vessels built,) it can be reduced. If the position is that we cannot now find timber of a sufficient size for building large vessels, that is up to the inspector who examines the ships to say that they are not fit to receive bounty, but that we still have timber in Newfoundland fit to build vessels of two hundred, two hundred and fifty, and three hundred tons, cannot be gainsaid.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—The point I was going to make was this, that if the bounty paid is ten per cent of the original cost, then it appears that the gentleman who have the vessels built are prepared to spend ninety per cent of their own money in vessels that are unfit for use. I cannot think that possible. The "Sordello" is owned by the Harmsworth people. It would be a reasonable argument that a firm of that character ought to build without bounty, but I think that if we could produce vessels of that type in our own country it would be a good proposition to pay the bounty, because the money for the labor, the materials for the ship, maintenance of the sails and so forth, would be left with our own people.

No doubt the Government has given a great deal of consideration to this measure and with the information before us I would not be disposed to object to the second reading, but I hope when we get into Committee we may get some further information that will give us stronger reasons for passing the Bill than we have at present.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—I am not saying anything against the second read-

ing of the Bill. I support it, but I would like to say that vessels are now being constructed. There was one during the past winter in Notre Dame Bay, and the Government Surveyor advises her owners to apply for Lloyd's Class. That vessel is over 200 tons, and if the Government Surveyor, who is a bona fide man, says we should apply for Lloyd's Class, then is it not absurd to say you cannot find timber here for vessels over 200 tons.

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

Hon. Mr. Shea moves the second reading of the Department of Marine and Fisheries Bill and said: This bill practically means the abolition of the Herring Board that has for some years past been dealing with the Herring Fishery, placing the conduct of that business under the management of the Fishery Board. It has been found that the Herring Fishery Board is not working satisfactorily and it is considered desirable to make the change I have outlined, and put matters on the same basis as it was originally. That is the Whole of the Bill.

The said Bill was there read a second time and ordered to be Committed on to-morrow.

Hon. President read a message from the House of Assembly, asking concurrence in the following Bills passed there, namely:—"An Act to amend Chap. 172 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland, (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Survey of Foreign-Going and Labrador Vessels';" "An Act to amend the Judicature Act," and "An Act to Confirm a Contract between the Government and the St. Lawrence Timber, Pulp and Steamship Company, Ltd."

Said Bills were then read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea the House then adjourned until to-morrow at 4.30 o'clock.

TUESDAY, May 18th, 1920.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea the Bills re Standardization of Codfish, Obtaining of Information Respecting the Codfishery, and Encouragement of Shipbuilding, were withdrawn and referred to a Select Committee to sit and report within three days. Said committee was appointed by Hon. President, Hons. Shea, Bishop, Winter, Sir Patrick McGrath, Grieve, Steer and Browning.

Bil re the Department of Marine & Fisheries passed through Committee Stage without amendment and was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea the remaining orders were deferred.

HON. MR| POWER:—Before the House adjourns I should like to congratulate you, Mr. President, on the high honour you have attained. I am sure you will perform the duties of the office with honor to all and credit to yourself. I also wish to voice my regrets at the passing of the three hon. gentlemen of this House, who have passed away since last session, Hons. Dr. Skeleton, John Harvey and A. F. Goodridge. I have not had opportunity to do so before, as I have been indisposed and have not been here previously. They were three particularly able men, especially Messrs. Harvey and Goodridge, and a great loss, not only a loss to this House, but a great loss to the country and the general business of the country. And the best thing we can say of them now is God give rest to their souls.

HON. PRESIDENT:—I thank the Hon. gentleman for his kindly reference to myself. There is no doubt this House lost three of its best members in the passing of the Hon. gentle-

men referred to, of which we took cognizance on the opening day.

Hon. Mr. Shea tabled report of schools under Salvation Army Boards.

House then adjourned until Thursday next at 4.30 o'clock.

THURSDAY, May 20, 1920.

The House met at 4.30 pursuant to adjournment.

Marine & Fisheries Bill

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Shea the Bill "An Act to amend Charter 11 of the consolidated Statues of Newfoundland (Third Serious) entitled of the Department of Marine and Fisheries" 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 amendment.

Survey of Vessels Bill

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Shea the Bill "An Act to amend Chapter 172 of the Consolidated Statues of Newfoundland (Third Cerious) entitled of the Survey of Foreign-going and Labrador Vessels" was read a second time, and ordered to be referred to a committee of the whole House on tomorrow.

Judicature re Amendment Bill

On motion of the Hon Mr. Shea the Bill "An Act to amend the Judicature Act" was read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

St. Lawrence Timber, Pulp and Steamship Co. Ltd.

Second reading of Bill entitled "An Act to Confirm a Contract between the Government and the St. Lawrence Timber, Pulp and Steamship Company Limited."

HON. MR. BROWNING:—Mr. President, this industry is a matter which I think the House ought to take into very careful consideration. The pulp industry is one which has developed from its initial stages to a most prosperous and aggressive business. The advances that have been made in this matter within the last few years are marvellous. The shortage of paper is a very serious thing, and the prices that are being paid now are much greater than could have been contemplated years ago when franchises were sought and granted and the business was very speculative.

I presume this is not the time to go into any details in this matter, but this Bill, it seems to me, is from its first sections right through objectionable in every phase. I presume that in committee would be the time to go into details, but I would now ask the members to take this into very serious consideration. I would object to Sections 1, 2, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, and I think that a very great deal in this Bill should be eliminated. I know of a company which started just a few years ago with preferred shares paying a dividend of seven per cent. with a bonus of 50% to the public on common shares. Today these common shares are in the market at five to one. That is, a person holding fifty shares of that stock when the company was started three or four years ago, today holds two hundred and fifty, paying a six per cent. dividend.

When that investment was made, it was about $9,000 and today if under normal circumstances, it is worth $35,000, or almost four times its value. This is an absolute conservative stock paying 6 per cent., and no doubt next year it will be paying ten on its common shares; and looking at that I do not think it reasonable for any person to come in here and ask special privileges for any industry that has such prospects before it. We in this country have been very liberal in granting franchises for people investing their monies, but this is one of the industries we should be able to make good revenue out of in future, out of the few areas of timber we have left, and instead of granting franchises and special privileges, fur-

ther than the privilege of getting free entry on machinery which we cannot manufacture here. All such should come in duty free, but the other franchises are, to my mind, very objectionable. There is one franchise there, the right of pre-emption, giving this company the right of procuring land from the individual if there is any objection to it, and providing that the company may demand it and arbitrate as to the amount to be paid. That, I think, is wrong, absolutely wrong, in principle; and any private individual, and a company is that after all, should be on the same basis as the individual in possession.

I will not occupy any further time today, but would ask hon. members to look carefully into the Bill and see that we are not giving away more than is justified.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—In explanation I may say, as it comes under my department, that this agreement was entered upon by the late Government. It was nullified by the present Government, one of our first acts. We considered that the interests of the country were not satisfactoriiy safeguarded. The bill as we introduces it is much in detail as that introduced by the late Government. From a party standpoint in the other branch of this Legislature it was nonpartisan. I may say in reply to my Hon. friend that the provisions of this bill conform fairly accurately to the Act of 1919 entitled An Act respecting the exportation of Timber. I may say further that this is a bonafide company. They are a large concern, not speculators or gamblers; and have received nothing in the line of limits of franchises from the Crown. The limits owned by them have been purchased from Salter & Son & McKie, who have been operating a mill in Main Arm of Bonne Bay for the last 20 years. It was not a grant from the Crown. Salter Bros. & McKie have the land under lears of 99 years from the Crown. The franchises granted them will not be explained now, but taken up section by section in committee. They are operating a large saw mill and propose to spend a million dollars, and put out 10,000 tons of pulp per year. It is a concern of some pretensions and some dimensions. I think the Grand Falls output is 30,000 tons, so you will see that it is quite a large proposition. I want to impress on Hon. gentlemen that it is not a speculative proposition. They are building houses and a large pier, and it is such a concern as this country needs. They are opening up a wilderness there and will employ a large number of people. When in Committee we will compare this with the privileges given by the late Government and perhaps then my Hon. friend will have a different opinion.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH—As the Hon. gentleman who took exception to the second reading suggested there were various clauses objectionable, might I ask him for some little further information as to why we should study it carefully and as to the nature of his objections. Personally I know nothing of the Bill and never saw it until a few moments ago. I listened with interest to the comments of my Hon. friend on my right and in reference to the particular instance he cited as regards pre-emption, I do not think his arguments very sound. If any company, which in good faith plants an enterprise of the dimensions suggested by the Hon. Minister of Agriculture & Mines is not to have the right of pre-emption, I do not know how it would be possible for any company to do business under any circumstances. If any man having a little bit of a house on it could hold up a company prepared to spend

a million dollars in order to extort a fabulous sum then it would be impossible to do business under any circumstances. And I submit that argument ought not to have much weight. At the same time there may be objectionable features in the bill and it would help us if the Hon. gentleman would suggest to the House the particular objections he has to the measure.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—I do not wish to detain the House just now, but ask Hon. gentlémen to look into the Bill because I think it very objectionable. There is this, that while this pulp and paper industry in its initial stages was not a profitable venture, it has got out of the speculative region altogether and become the most profitable in the world today. As regards the employment o labor, in this country at present, we are not seeking labor, but laborers. Any company coming in now ought to start up as any other firm or person would start up on their own basis and not ask for any special favors or franchises. It is a beginner's scheme to make good money, and I contend that it is not necessary to give them concessions just because some other company got it in the past. That day has gone, and we ought to-day to see what the country is going to get out of this. That is the point I want to make. If this was a speculative business it would be the natural thing, but all the companies in Canada of this class have been doubling and doubling their stock over and over again, there is no pulp industry in Canada but is paying and paying handsomely. I want to remove this industry from the class of one which requires encouragement and have them come in and open up on such a basis as any other industry.

The Bill was read a second time and ordered to be committed on tomorrow.

Hon. Mr. Shea tabled the Report of the Registrar of Births, Marriages and Deaths, and also information asked for by Hon. Mr. Browning.

House then adjourned until Tuesday next at 4.30 o'clock.

TUESDAY, May 26th, 1920.

The House met at 4.30 pursuant to adjournment.

Survey of Vessels Bill

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Shea the House went into Committee on the Bill "An Act to amend Chapter 172 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Survey of Foreign-Going and Labrador Vessels'."

Hon. Mr. Murphy in the Chair.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—Is it proposed under this Act to have the vessel surveyed after every voyage. Supposing, for instance, I send a vessel up to Sydney on the first of June and the vessel gets back on the 10th of June, shall she be surveyed and resurveyed The wording should be "Annual Survey" or something of that sort. It is absurd to say that the owner of any vessel shall upon every trip have the vessel surveyed. It would take a large amount of time in addition to the expense. We ought to modify that section in some measure.

HON. MR. SHEA:—Supposing a vessel left here and went to Green Bay and was damaged, something would have to be done in that case.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—I think a suggestion was made that a survey should not be compulsory more than once a year except in case of damage.

OHN. MR. GRIEVE:—If that is so, that is quite satisfactory.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Might I also ask whether there should not be an alternative in the penalty clause. There is only a fine stated and no provision for the alternative of imprison-

ment. Supposing a man will not pay the fine, what are you going to do about it? It is not that I want a person sent to gaol, but I think the alternative should be inserted in the Bill.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—I think there is a general proviso in the Consolidated Statutes to the effect that if a fine is not paid a man may be sent to prison.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Of course, if there is, that does away with the necessity for it in each individual Bill, but in three Bills that have come before this House there has been the alternative of imprisonment; a man has to pay $1,000 or go to gaol for three months, $100.00 or go to gaol for one month. If there is a general clause in the Consolidated Statutes we ought to cut it out of all the Bills or insert the alternative in this Bill.

(Amendment taken note of.)

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—Mr. Chairman, would you also kindly take note of my objection to repeated surveys.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—I think, Mr. Chairman, that the object of that Section is to make it obligatory upon the owner of a vessel to see that the vessel is kept in a seaworthy condition. Now if an annual survey be held there is no reason why the owner of a vessel should not get a certificate of seaworthiness for every trip, as an ocean-liner or steamer gets. It is only a matter of form, and the object of the Section is to endeavour to cure—if I may use that word—a condition of affairs which arose during the past few years where vessels have proceeded to sea and have been lost, and valuable property lost, and lives lost, while if there had been a proper inspection and examination of the vessels such would not have occurred.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—Some of those which have been lost have been perfectly new vessels. Then again, steamers are only surveyed once a year.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—If a vessel be in a seaworthy condition it is only a matter of form for that vessel to get a certificate for every voyage. If such a rule had been put into effect during the past few years, much valuable property would not have been destroyed, because the vessels would not have been allowed to proceed to sea.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—Take the case of an Allan steamer lost some time ago. The last thing that was done was a survey of the vessel, and she was never heard of again. It is not fair to assume that all the vessels that leave here and are lost are unseaworthy.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—I do not mean my statement to apply to all, but many vessels have been lost which in all probability would not have been lost if they had been subjected to survey before they left port, as they have left port without a certificate of seaworthiness having been obtained, and it is only reasonable to assume that in some cases vessels have been lost which would not have gone down if the owner had been compelled to take out a certificate of seaworthiness. The object of this rule is to protect life and property.

HON. MR. SHEA:—I do not think there is any great hardship in this clause. To get a certificate for every voyage is only a matter of form; it does not impose any hardship. If there be any error, it is certainly erring on the right side.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—But there is a hardship. Take, for instance, the case of a steamer which comes in here and wants to leave immediately. Perhaps the surveyor will not work after six. That means that the vessel has to wait until the next day to be surveyed. We are anxious to protect life as much as possible, but all the surveying in the world will not prevent marine disaster, and I think it would be a great hardship to subject ships to survey more than once a year

unless the surveyor in discharge of his duty find it necessary to call upon the owner to see that the ship be put in proper condition.

HON. MR. SHEA:—If we leave it an open question it will not be done at all.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—Mr. Chairman, I would point out to the honorable member that if an annual certificate only is required, the vessel may at any time prior to the expiration of that annual certificate have become in a condition that is unseaworthy, and that would be no way of finding that out. If all vessels are made subject to a survey, in the case of any vessel that is unseaworthy, the survey is only a matter of form. At the present time foreign-going vessels have absolutely no protection whatever. All that is called for is an annual survey. The surveyor may make recommendations, but there is nothing of a binding character which is so necessary to protect life and property.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—The unseaworthiness of a vessel would very soon be determined by the man who is going to ship a cargo in her. I have in my recollection now a case within the last twelve months where a comparatively new vessel came down here, the "Nado," and the charterer refused to load her until she had gone on dock and been submitted to considerable repair, and that vessel was put on dock and subsequently loaded. My point is that a weekly or fortnightly survey of ships engaged in short voyages is absurd. As a schooner-owner I have my vessels surveyed, put them on dock once or twice a year, and take precautions to keep my property in repair and conserve the lives of men. This is a most vexatious clause in this Bill to compel me after every voyage to have my vessel surveyed. It would be apparent if the vessel is not seaworthy. If she has come in making water, the fact will be public property, and the vessel will be docked. But this Bill as it stands at present is vexatious and will not accomplish the object that is intended.

I daresay a weekly survey would be better than once a year, but I think that once a year would be quite sufficient to determine the condition of a vessel and any owner knowing his vessel his vessel was not in refrain is not going to risk his vessel and the lives of his men.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—It is to be remembered also that not half the vessels coming here for cargoes come in to St. John's, and what is going to happen in Northern or Western outports, and vessels coming from Iceland and Denmark. In most cases, of course, these vessels are classed vessels and in good enough condition to take their cargoes, but I do not see how you are going to provide to have a surveyor at every port and have vessels cleaned out as they must be for a survey, and in some cases it would prove a hardship. I think also along the lines of Hon. Mr. Grieve it seems certainly unnecessary to compel a vessel to have a survey every time she goes to, say, Sydney, to take coals. If the period of 12 months is too long, it might at least be confined to narrower limits than that and say not often than every three months if she sustains damage. But I think it will create hardship and evasion.

Committee rose and reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

House went into Committee on the Judicature Act Bill, Hon. Mr. MacNamara in the chair.

HON. MR. SHEA:—As Hon. members will see, this Bill is one regulating the fees of lawyers.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—This Bill is the outcome of the high cost of

living. In a matter of this kind we have to protect the public. The fees charged by a lawyer which amounted to ten dollars in the past will be increased to fifty or one hundred dollars in the future. I do not object to the fees. In many cases they are well earned.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—That depends on whether one wins or not.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—Mr. Chairman if the legal fees are to be increased five hundred or six hundred per cent I fail to see the reason why special jurors should not receive the increase also. The whole principle of the Bill is wrong unless made universal.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I took occasion to enquire from a legal gentleman the explanation of terms Lower and Higher Scale. The two scales, lower and higher, do not mean lower scale and higher scale of fees as compared with the past. They refer to particular classes of cases. The lower scale applies to the majority of cases which comes before court; the higher to those cases of exceptional difficulty. In the case of two vessels running into one another, the lower scale would apply. In the Cable Co's. case the higher.

If fees of legal gentlemen are increased, jurors and petty-jurors should be given something commensurate with present cost of living.

An ordinary witness, who may have to spend a whole day in court is allowed today two dollars; professional men—legal and medical—are allowed four dollars. This is too small. Architects and surveyors are given two dollars and fifty. I think we should advance those fees.

HON. MR. SHEA:—I am informed these fees are increased and that they have been increased.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—I was about to ask what or who determines the classification advocated in high or low—if the judge, it ought to be so stated. I agree with the other speakers that fees allowed to jurors are too small.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—In order to become better informed concerning this Bill, I beg to move that it be deferred till tomorrow.

The Committee in charge of the Bill entitled "An Act to amend the Judicature" rose and reported it had made some progress and asked leave to sit again.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea the House went into Committee of the Whole on Bill entitled "An Act to Confirm a Contract Between the Government and the St. Lawrence Timber, Pulp and Steamship Company, Limited."

Hon. Mr. Mews in the Chair.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—This company is operating in this country. Why then did they go to Great Britain for incorporation?

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—This is a bona fide Company, previously incorporated in the United Kingdom, who, having a large capital, purchased large properties held on 99 years lease by the Reid Nfld. Co. and further properties held by Salters' Sons, Sydney. These leases have all been renewed for 99 years, and every thing in the Bill is in the very best interests of the country, and in fullest accord with the provisions of the 1918 Crown Lands Act.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—It is a common thing for a company to be incorporated outside the country. A company operating in Newfoundland may be incorporated in Canada or England.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the House to the information I have got with regard to pitprops. I understand that the Anglo Newfoundland Development Company

have bought up all the pitprops that have been cut here and are grinding them into pulp, why should this company be allowed to export what can be manufactured in the country. I know, as a matter of fact, that the A. N. D. Company have purchased pitprops from people who would otherwise export them, and I understand they are grinding them into pulp. The fact of the matter is that the value of pulp nowadays is so very different from the value a few years ago. I understand that the price of pulp a few years ago was $30.00. Now it is $80.00 and $90.00. In fact, I understand that when pulp mills were started here, $15.00 was considered a very fair price for pulp, but a few years ago it went to $30.00, and now it has gone up three times as much. Therefore, I think that before these people are given the right to export pitprops, this matter should be looked into. An Act was passed last year whereby the Government would have the power to give licenses to export pitprops. Previous to that pitprops were not allowed to be exported.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES:—That was only a War Measure.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—Now the war is over. It was considered before that pitprops were not profitable to export. Now that the war is over, and particularly when pitprops can be converted into an article of commerce, why should their exportation be permitted now. If the Harmsworth people are grinding two and a half inch wood, why should these people be allowed to export six inch wood?

HON. MR. BISHOP:—They have not yet a pulp mill to grind it in. This Bill only gives them permission to export for one year while they are erecting their mill.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—The Bill gives them two years. The pitprops that the Harmsworth people are buying have been on the bank for four years and more. They are not like a perishable article. Therefore, I think, Mr. Chairman, that this privilege ought to be very carefully gone into, and we ought to be assured that these could not be utilized here, and if they can be utilized here, they ought not to be allowed to go out of the country.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES:—I might say, Mr. Chairman, in reply to my honourable friend, that I think the St. Lawrence people would be prepared to utilize everything they could. The law provides that a person who owns a mill can export pitprops. That was the Act of 1919. It has been estimated by pulp people that twenty per cent. of every tree used for pulp is left on the ground as slash. I have never heard before until to-day that two and a half inch trees could be used for pulp. However, we will investigate the matter. I know the A. N. D. Co. would not take advantage of the clause in their agreement to export pitprops only the cost of the transportation of the slash to the sea would cost too much, and it has been a problem with them what to do with their slash. I may say that the St. Lawrence people are only getting in this contract what was allowed them in the Act of last year. There is a slight increase in the size, and the idea is to even up the size of pitprops because if they are of uniform size they will market better. We cannot change the Crown Lands' Act all in a minute. Perhaps we are making a mistake in permitting the exportation of pitprops. Perhaps the Crown Lands' Act is a mistake from end to end. I do not believe that any man in Newfoundland knows what timber lands and water powers Newfoundland has. There has been no survey of timber lands and water powers, and the quicker we can afford to do that the better. The Provinces of New Bruns-

wick and Quebec are making the most of their timber lands and water powers, and I think this Dominion has a valuable asset in such resources. Another question in my mind is the question of reforestation. The pulp and paper question has become a burning one with everybody in the newspaper business in the world. Paper is getting scarcer all the time, and I do not think that we have the area of timber lands that the people of Newfoundland imagine we have. They look at a map of Newfoundland with so much colored red here and there, and the red is timber land. It is the rashest and crudest kind of guess. We may have a survey by airship and aeroplanes, but it would give no particulars. It would tell marsh land from timber land, bog land from lake, but it would not tell us what the actual kind of timber was. It might be pulp wood, timber land, or scrap wood. We have to go at it in the old-fashioned way by a general survey. I think we are doing right in this agreement, although my honourable friend may not agree with me. We are merely confirming with some slight alterations and agreement which the late Government had with this Company. The Company is converting what has been a wilderness into a manufacturing centre. I think they intend to adopt a reforestation scheme. Messrs. McKie & Company operated a mill there for many years, but they were in forced idleness all winter long. Now we have a bona fide concern which will give employment all winter long. It is a prosperous concern already. It is a concern which means business. It is taking nothing from the country. It is what we want, a **bona fide** concern which will manufacture our timber, I hope coupled up with a reforestation scheme, and I trust that the day of the timber gambler will soon be a thing of the past.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—So far as I have been able to ascertain at present, I cannot help regarding this Bill as a good Bill, and I think that the interests of the country are thoroughly safeguarded by its provisions. There is one thing that strikes me as peculiar, and I am inclined to think there must be something wrong. The Bill applies only to an area of 425 acres.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES:—I think that must be a misprint. They have an area of 230 miles.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—Well then, they are square miles instead of acres. That would make quite a difference. Apart from that I think this is a good Bill, and I think we should have no hesitation in passing it.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—May I throw some light on the remarks of my honorable friend, Mr. Browning. He says the Harmsworth people are buying pit props. This is in a large measure due to the fact that the Harmsworth people are short of pulp wood as a result of the reduced operations during war time. They contemplate an extension of their plant, and they find themselves obliged to gather in all the wood they possibly can along the coast at points from which this material can be brought to Botwood and come up to Grand Falls. To facilitate them in getting this material to the mills they purchased a steam trawler which is to be used for drawing this out of the inlets of Notre Dame Bay and bringing it in where it can be handled. The Grand Falls people are planning an extension now which will enable them to increase by fifty per cent. That is to say, if their mills were now making a hundred tons, within a couple of years they hope to be able to make three hundred. What has been said about the shortage of pulp and paper is quite correct.

While I was in New York I had the pleasure of attending the sessions of the American Newspaper Publishers' Association, which had its annual convention in the Waldorf Astoria Hotel the third week in April, and the whole cry was, How are we going to get paper? Some of those who had not been fortunate enough to secure contracts would possibly have to pay twenty cents per pound. In many cases they were paying thirteen and fourteen cents. There is a boom in paper and pulp, and in my opinion this country is going to benefit greatly by it; but, of course, it remains to be seen how long the boom is going to last. We have had booms before and they have not lasted very long.

It is because of this that it is desirable that we should get everybody we possibly can to build mills. I know nothing of this Bill, but on principle I favor the establishment of local industries, and I think the concessions these get are in the main not any mistake. When the Harmsworth people came here ten years ago most honorable gentlemen will remember the country was shaken up from end to end, protesting against the character of the concessions they were getting. Well, we all know now that the Harmsworth industry has been one of the best things that has ever happened this country. Thousands of people have secured employment at good wages. If we can duplicate that, even in a small way, at Bonne Bay, I think it is very desirable that we should do so, provided we are not making any extravagant concessions.

I am against the policy of permitting the exportation of pit props that it is at all possible to manufacture in this country, and now with the prospect of pulp and paper companies being able to manufacture this material I should think the chances are that there would be very little of it to export. By this Bill the company is to spend $1,000,000, and I do not think it is unreasonable for them to get these concessions, because if they do it helps them out in their finances, and on the other hand, it is a debatable question whether they will be able to get steamers to bring the wood from the country. The honorable gentlemen who were here will remember the discussion four or five years ago on the subject of permitting pit props to go out of the country as a war measure. Well, everybody started to cut pitp rops, but I think if the Colony had all the money that was lost in the pit prop enterprise it would go a good way to wiping out a deficit at some future time, which we all hope is a long way off. But with regard to the question of assisting a company like this which is coming in in good faith, putting its money into a plant, I think we ought to hesitate to put any obstruction in its way.

I would like to call the attention of the Honorable Minister of Agriculture and Mines to the fact that he said the company had purchased a certain portion of land from Messrs. McKie & Company, and a certain portion from the Reids, and that Messrs. McKie & Company had been operating twenty or twenty-five years, while from the introductory clauses of this Bill it seems that the company must have other land, because it seems to have been granted under leases of May, 1917, and July, 1918.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES:—They are renewals for a further period of ninety-nine years.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Thank you.

HON. MR. McNAMARA:—Section 2 states that this company shall be in operation within three years. Sections 5, 6 and 7 have allowed exemption from taxation for five years. Why should they be exempted from taxation for five years when they must

have their plant ready and in operation within three years?

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES:—I might explain that the Crown Lands' Act provides that they shall commence building within two years and proceed to operate their plant within five years, but we made it less in this case; they have to commence building within twelve months, and be in operation within three years. The exemption for five years is an exemption under the Revenue Act and applies to all concerns.

HON. MR. McNAMARA:—There is another thing. There is no clause in this Act covering the wages of working men. I do not think it is unusual for a paragraph of that sort to appear in an Act, as I think the Railroad Act made provision for the wages of working men. The reason I refer to this matter is that a man working at Sydney Mines I understand gets thirty cents an hour; the men working at the same class of work here in St. John's are getting twenty-five cents an hour. In other words, a Newfoundlander in Newfoundland is getting five cents an hour less than a Newfoundlander in Sydney is paid. I think this is unfair, and I think there should be some clause to protect working men. At Grand Falls I understand the men get thirty-five cents an hour, and I think it is of vital importance to laboring men that will be engaged in this industry that some clause should be put there to that effect.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE & MINES:—It is not usual for contracts of this class to have a minimum wage clause. There is no such clause for the A. N. D. Co., the Dominion Iron & Steel Company or the Nova Scotia Steel & Coal Company.

HON. MR. McNAMARA:—So much the worse for the poor man. Such a clause appears in the Railroad Act. There is a provision for payment of $1.25 a day and I think there should be some protection for these men who cannot protect themselves.

HON. MR. MURPHY:—Every man that is looking for labor to-day knows that he will have to pay for it. Here they are not backward, and the people in the Bonne Bay section are just as intelligent as in any other part of the country, and as soon as this company wants men you will find that there is no need for us to look after their interests. They will get all the Harmsworth people are paying and their neighbours are getting. I think this Bill on the whole is a very reasonable one. When we started a few years ago to send our pulpwood over we could not get enough for it after paying the freight, and everybody who touched that proposition, including myself, lost thousands of dollars. We are getting twice as much as we are giving, and you need not be alarmed as long as this company is compelled to carry out the contract and spend $250,000 this year, and $250,000 the next and so on to erect a pulp mill. I do not think we need be alarmed as to what they are going to do with any timber that they cannot make pulp of, and they will have to have a very much larger piece of land than they have to be able to export much timber. We have been doing more butchering than timbering during the last thirty or forty years. We have left more in the woods than we have taken out. This is a very broad statement, and I know what I am talking about. To get four or five trees you must cut ten, fifteen or twenty. There is nothing of any service to go to any saw mill that is smaller than six inches. It was only when the wood got scarce I began to cut that size. All that were cut down and were not of that size were left. Take it altogether, there was more left in the woods than was brought out, and it was left there to turn into blasted boughs, ready for a fire. It takes two cords of timber to

make one thousand feet. If you take two cords of timber, saw it square by hand as has been done, and take the bark off by hand, it will cost you more to do that than to put it through the saw mill or grind it up. So that if you do send it out you pay more money to get it out than to put it through the mill. Whichever way we look at it, it is alright. To-day somebody is afraid this company will make too much money, and that is the difficulty with us. When the Anglo Newfoundland Development Company came we had a public meeting protesting against the granting to them of the concessions. We nearly lost the A. N. D. Company. They were negotiating in Canada and the States, and it was only by luck that they came here at last. It is the same way in this case. Let us get them first to put their money in it, give them every encouragement, and we need not bother our heads about them after that; the men will get the proper wages that should be paid them. And the big pot of money is going to be left in this country before they can get any pulp or paper or any thing else. There is no danger of our losing, but for goodness sake get them here, that is the main thing. Another matter the hon. gentleman spoke of and I am glad he mentioned it. We have been sending surveyors around the country looking for something to do, whereas we have beautiful water powers, and know nothing of their extent, how much power they can develop, or anything whatever about it. But go to the Canadian Crown Lands' Department and you can find out all about it, what the drainage area is, what water is there, what power it can develop and so on. Here we know nothing whatever, as they have never been surveyed. It is the same with our timber lands. I hope the Minister will take this matter up so that anybody coming in here would have something official to go on. So far as this Bill is concerned let us for gracious sake get them in and get their money, and we shall take care of them afterwards.

The Committee reported the Bill without amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

Hon. Mr. Bishop tabled report of Select Committee on Standardization of Codfish Bill, Codfish Information Bill and Encouragement of Shipbuilding Bill, and moved that they be considered in Committee on to-morrow.

The House then adjourned until to-morrow at four o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, May 26, 1920.

House met pursuant to adjournment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea the St. Lawrence Timber Pulp and Stemship Co. Confirmation Bill was read a third time and passed and ordered sent to the Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same without amendment.

House went into Committee on the Judicature Act Bill.

HON. MR. SHEA:—In reference to remarks of some hon. gentlemen yesterday regarding this Bill, I have obtained some further information and find the fees are compiled by the Law Society with the sanction and approval of the Court authorities. The lower scale of fees was in force for some years and applies to cases involving $25, and the higher fees apply to cases of a higher grade, subject to the taxation of the taxing master. It is also to be borne in mind that the fees paid witnesses and jurors are not paid as compensation for services rendered, or the Court is in a position to demand such services, but is given as somewhat of a recompense for loss of time. All fees for bailiffs, etc., have been increased in recent years, as it was found these men would no longer act

under the old rates. The fee formerly paid witnesses was 75c. but is now, under this Bill, $1.50. The fees appear to have been satisfactory, whether to the public remains to be seen, but have been so to the Court authorities and have their imprimatur and approval and we now ask for the imprimatur and approval of this Council.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—I have no objection to the Bill, but I think the business man is just as valuable as a professional man and should get $4.00 if the latter is worth that. Many would prefer to give $4.00 or even $10.00 to stay away, but at least a business man's time is worth every bit as much as the professional man.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—As I raised some objection yesterday, I think it only fair to say that I made some inquiries today and find that all fees of officials were raised, and I think it is well therefore the Bill should go through as it stands. It appears, however, the scale of fees should have been drafted by a Committee of the Supreme Court, consisting of the Judges and certain of the barristers. These gentlemen thought, however, they would escape some responsibility by throwing it on the Legislature. I think they should have shouldered the responsibility, but as they have put it to the House I do not know if we ought to reject it at this stage.

The Committee reported the Bill without amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time on tomorrow.

House went into Committee on the Standardization of Codfish Bill, Hon. Mr. Anderson in the chair.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill with some amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time on tomorrow.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—Mr. President, I hold in my hand the petition of which I gave notice yesterday and which I have been asked to present to this House.

I feel, sir, that no greater honour has ever been accorded to me than the privilege of presenting to the House the prayer of the petitioners.

The original petition which has been presented to the other Branch of the Legislature contains the signatures of 1700 women of St. John's of legal age. The only regret I feel, sir, in connection with this petition is that it should have appeared necessary to the women of St. John's to appeal on their own behalf to the Legislature to grant them the Franchise, and while I willingly present the petition, and urge as I do in the strongest possible manner, the rights of the petitioners, I feel, and feel strongly, it should not be necessary for our noble women to come to the Legislature as suppliants. Their right to be placed upon an equality with men must be recognised by all and should be immediately accorded, for even slow-moving England, after many years of opposition, has, as we all know, capitulated and granted the vote to the women of Great Britain. If there ever were doubts in the minds of the sterner sex in this country respecting the rights of women in relation to the regulation and government of civic or political matters surely that day has passed, and it cannot be that either appeal or argument is necessary—especially in this chamber—to assure the petitioners that their prayer will be granted, and granted in the fullest measure in the near future.

I feel sure that no member of this House will be found to question the right of women to the fullest political privileges. A few years ago, perhaps, none of us knew or understood the aspirations of women, or if we did, few of us were willing to acknowledge before what we are compelled to ac-

knowledge to-day. No one who has seen, as I have had the privilege of seeing, the surprising magnitude of the work accomplished by women during the war and how great was the share they so willingly assumed in the Empire's titanic struggle, could fail to acknowledge the debt of the Empire to its women.

For many years past I have felt that the privilege of **the vote** should have been granted to women as to men, tho I had no sympathy or patience with the militant, unsufferable suffragette, but the attitude and the action of the suffragettes, Sir, and particularly of Mrs. Pankhurst during the war, won my admiration. Many of them, and notably Mrs. Pankhurst, whom I have had the pleasure of hearing upon public platforms during the years of conflict, were foremost in activity in the efforts to win the war. The way these women laid aside their pet hobby during the war and unceasingly applied their energy and marked ability to war work propaganda was an inspiration to thousands of men hitherto unimpressed and shamed many slackers into activity. When the war was won, the nation lost no time in acknowledging with gratitude that the part taken up by women and so effectively accomplished disarmed all further criticism, and **"votes for women,"** so long sought for, and fought for—was won not by their making war, but through their acknowledged share in winning for Great Britain and her Allies the great **world** war.

Even if everybody will not accept my own belief that it was the women of the British Empire and of France who won the war, all will, I think acknowledge that but for the part performed by our women we should not have been winners, and would be fighting still, if indeed we could have withstood for so long the forces of our Enemy. But we have been saved, thanks to our women, as **I** think and as many others think, from the ignominy of defeat.

I remember during the tour of Great Britain and France in 1916 by the Overseas Members of Parliament when inspecting the manufacture of Munitions of War in a very large factory in Sheffield where 2500 women were employed doing work of various kinds, some working lathes—hard and strenuous work, others doing delicate or intricate work demanding great skill, and the whole place a beehive of industry. I remember saying to a very bright looking girl engaged in loading shells: "this seems to be a busy day," she smilingly replied, "just as usual." "Do you like the work," I then asked. "Oh, the work is all right, Sir, and besides **'we have to beat the Germans'.**" Such was the sentiment animating the tens of thousands of young women we saw engaged upon the manufacture of war material of all conceivable kinds throughout England and Scotland.

And it was not alone manifested in the manufacture of munitions or by the thousands engaged in the various departments of the Government, the War Office, or the Admiralty, where directly or indirectly their work must be classed as war work, but in the hundred and one other capacities where we have seen women engaged in work to keep the home fires burning, and the populace fed.

In many cases, during the years of war, the women were doing work which nobody had believed women to be capable of accomplishing. They proved, however, not alone capable of, but they thrived upon hard work. One could not help admiring them in whatever capacity they were employed, whether as porters, window cleaners or the suitably uniformed picturesque farmerettes, but to those women whose time and skill was directed to ministering to the sick and wounded fighters for the Flag and

Empire, must the laurel wreath be given, and especially I think to those thousands of splendid girls known as V. A. D's.—the workers of the Voluntary Aid Detachments—who, without fee or reward—save the reward which always comes from the knowledge of duties faithfully performed—labored in the hospitals as assistants to the Sisters and Nurses. I remember asking one last year how long she had been doing V. A. D. work; she said: "My people would not let me take it up at first, but I was determined I would not stay at home doing notning, so I've been at it for about three years." "Did you not tire of it?" I asked, to which she replied: "I have often been very tired, but as you know, Sir, we had a very big job on, and this was my part of the job." Such was the spirit and pluck of V. A. D's.

Who can ever forget that incident which occurred in connection with the torpedoing of a troopship in the early part of the war, in the Eastern Mediterranean? When the ship was struck by the torpedo, the nurses lined up on the deck as they had been instructed, and as soon as the boats were ready for lowering they were ordered to take their places in the boats. Did they become panic-stricken? Did they rush to the boats for safety? No. but their answer to the command was: "No, no, save the men, save the fighting men, first," and twelve of these noble women, refusing the chance of safety, went down with the ship. Their graves are unmarked, but their heroic sacrifice for the honor of their calling, and the maintenance of the best traditions of our race should never be forgotten.

With such examples before us, surely none will be found to deny to the women of this land the exercise of their undoubted right. Our women, Sir, during the past five years have been nobly doing their part for the Empire's cause. We were well represented, tho not in great numbers, it is true, in France and in Great Britain, and it was a delight to meet, as I did, some of our young women on the other side of the Atlantic, and to hear from various sources how competent and how reliable they were found to be by those under whom they worked. I am glad and proud that Newfoundland shared in that great dynamic force—the women war workers of the nation.

And those who could not go across and do active war work, how faithfully they worked at home in the interest of and for the benefit and comfort of our own sailors and soldiers. And they are not yet weary in their well doing, for but a few days ago we assisted here in passing an Act to Incorporate thereby giving permanence to the Women's Patriotic Association. They are now giving their attention to Child Welfare—than which no subject is more important.

Mr. President, I feel that every member of this House will wish to express his desire to support the prayer of this petition and to assure the petitioners that the Bill which will undoubtedly come before us, will receive unanimous support. This, Sir, is not a matter to be treated lightly or with jest, it is no ordinary occasion, but is an epoch-making event. I say this in all seriousness for such I conceive it to be. I am led to this conclusion as I look around this chamber, because of what I know of these members who are in the enjoyment of man's most cherished possession, and of those of us who still cherish memories of the possession we have lost awhile.

Mr. President, I beg to present the petition and move that it be now read.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—I rise with much pleasure to support the prayer of the petition before the House. For many years I have on the floors of this

House advocated votes for women, and if I had my way at the last session of this House the vote would have been granted. I am proud to avail of this opportunity, (with so many ladies present), of expressing my views in favour of the petition.

In the Bill introduced in 1917 in the British House of Commons, votes were given to women over thirty years of age. The franchise at that time gave 835,000 women the right to vote, but the Bill passed in 1918 increased the votes of women to six million, five million of the six were married. There is a balance of one million. They found they had made a mistake. A very few of the million wished it to be known that they were over thirty years of age. The present session of the British House of Commons is bringing franchise down to twenty-one years, so that women will be on a par with men.

In supporting the Bill, I may say, I know of no reason why women should not get the vote. In the British House of Commons there is one lady member. Not so many years ago a suffragette was told by a Conservative on a beautiful afternoon she should be more interested in the purchase of a millinery hat than in searching for the franchise. She replied that it would be better for her honourable friend if he interested himself in purchasing a pair of braces to brace himself up, for he should need bracing before she was done with him.

Women can take their place in any department of life. My Honourable friend, Mr. Bishop, spoke of the work done by women during the war. I am sorry I cannot state exactly the amount of work done by the women of this Dominion. This is not a statistical country—we do not keep facts as we should—but I do know their work during the war was enormous. In England one million five hundred and sixteen thousand women worked in men's positions up to the end of April, 1919. Three months later 1,659,000 women were doing the work formerly done by men. Is that not argument in favour of granting them the franchise? Many of the women assisted in building houses; 594,000 were munition workers. They had also been working at other trades and in Government establishments. Two hundred and thirty thousand women occupied Government positions. Thirty-three thousand did work in civil service. Many of them did this work gratuitously—in the interest of their country and Empire and us, and of those who have gone from this country. Women all over the Empire have done their part and have done it well. Why should the Government refuse them what is their due right? So long as I have a voice on the floor of this House I shall speak in favour of woman suffrage. Women sitting in the House will raise the moral tone and be able to accomplish much work.

Mr. President I support this petition before the House and only regret I have not the details of the work done by the women of Newfoundland during the war. In Canada, New Zealand and South Africa the franchise has been granted them, why are we always last? We should have given them the vote long, long ago.

Now Mr. President, one other point —it is this. The army enlistment from July, 1915, to July, 1918, was 4,800,096, the influx of women into industrial work was 2,366,000. This work went on night and day. At the industrial centres—Sheffield, Leeds, etc., which Hon. Mr. Bishop visited; the work continued for the twenty-four hours of the day through the whole war, and to do that the women were prepared to sacrifice much and are even yet making sacrifices. I assure them they have my support.

HON. MR. MEWS:—I wish to draw attention to the fact that the cover-

ings on the guns in the park and in front of the House were removed yesterday. I do not know whether the gentleman usher of the Black Rod had anything to do with this. If it frightened the ladies away yesterday it has not to-day, for they have come in increased forces and made their way into this chamber. I hope soon to see them come to occupy seats in this chamber. In rising to support this petition I say the principle of equal suffrage is a sound one. It seems to me to be obviously sound. I only regret with Hon. Mr. Bishop that it has become necessary for women to ask or plead in a petition for the franchise, to plead as for something which is not due to them, as a concession or a privilege to be granted by mere man, and not as a right which the Government of former days and this Government should have granted without its being asked for in this manner. The objections to equal suffrage now are few and far between. Those who have been prominent in objecting now come down to the statement that they would not like to see women with the vote, simply because it would bring them into the arena of politics, and politics are not too clean. Of course the obvious retort to that is that the sooner the women get the vote and get into politics, the quicker will politics become clean. Another objection is that woman has her sphere in the home. But, Mr. President, it seems to me that that does not mean anything. It does not mean that the home must be a prison, and that because woman is doing greater work in the home than perhaps any man is doing in his office or at his business she cannot exercise the intelligence that she undoubtedly possesses on any great question that is before the country any less than any man who goes down in a store on Water Street or works on a wharf, or works at a business or any other occupation. The carrying on of a home should not be considered any less in importance than any other business. To give the franchise to women does not mean that all the women will immediately forsake their homes and rush into politics; it does not mean that in the case of men who have the suffrage. They go to their business just in the ordinary way. They are not all in politics. In many of the stores here we allow women to go to work, and in almost every department nowadays, and it does not seem quite fair that we should deny them the right to express their opinions on public matters when their fellow-workers of the male sex have that right. I would also point in this House to the fact that women have come into their own in this House in that we have two ladies here.

We have at present two ladies who occupy seats on the floors of this House, and though at the present time they are not allowed to answer back, Mr. President, you know and I know they are taking a note of every word we uter and at some future day it may come back to us. I refrain from speaking extensively on the war work of women. To my mind this war work was something that woman did because she was a woman. She did the war work so well because right from the beginning she has been bearing most of the suffering in the world and caring most for the suffering, and the fact that she did war work was only a natural thing for her to do, and she accepted it. Of course, it led men to think more highly of her. But they should have known before what she would do. Mr. President, it seems to me that the case is not one that can be labored, because there is only one side to this question, I think, and that is, that the women should get

the vote, and I think we might well follow the example of South Africa, which only two weeks ago granted women the franchise.

HON. MR. McGRATH:—I should like briefly, Mr. President, to express my sympathy with the prayer of the petition, and to endorse all that has been said in support of it. With the observations of the honourable gentleman who introduced the petition in regard to the war work done by the women of Great Britain and the Overseas Dominions, including our own Colony, I am in entire accord, and I think that if women had no other claim to put forward in support of their demand for a vote, that would be ample to justify any Legislature in giving it to them. But apart from that altogether, I think the women had even before the war justified their claim. Women had been voting in Municipal elections and local government elections in the mother country for some years without any very destructive results, but rather with very substantial benefits. New Zealand and Australia even before that gave votes to women, not alone in Municipal, but in Federal or general elections, and the results there had been to greatly improve the character of the legislation enacted by these Parliaments, legislation in the direction of bettering the condition of the children and women, and social progress generally. The same thing has occurred in the United States and in the different individual States where woman suffrage has prevailed, and while the American record, like the British, is only one woman representative in Parliament, Miss Rankin of Nebraska, a predecessor of Lady Astor, still it does not follow that women will not have in the early years to come representatives in the American Parliament just as we expect to see Lady Astor supported by a small but steadily growing band of women in the Imperial Parliament, and I trust that representatives of the fair sex will be in our Legislature.

Properly speaking, of course, a Woman's Suffrage measure must emanate from the Lower House. That House has to determine the character of the electorate which will elect members to constitute that branch of the Legislature, and our part at the present time can be merely thepious hope that the House may deal with this in the near future, and an undertaking that when the Bill comes to us we will do our part. I think it will be possible to effect a compromise even if there should be some delay in having this measure receive recognition in the early future, and that is, to adopt the suggestion advanced recently and provide that women be granted full franchise in the next Municipal election in St. John's and try the experiment in that way. If a Municipal Bill should come before us at this session or the next session without a section in it providing for woman suffrage for the next Municipal Council which will be elected under that Bill I think it would be within the province of this House—I speak subject to somebody setting me right—but I think it would be within our province to introduce into this House an amendment to enable the experiment to be tried in that way, and I hope the ladies of St. John's and the women of the country generally will be satisfied with making a start in that direction if it is not possible to have the general bill become operative before that. Perhaps indeed it might be desirable that the experiment be tried in that fashion. But whether or not, I would say with those gentleman who preceded me that I thoroughly believe in the principle that women should have a vote as

well as men. It is only one step more in social evolution, to the progress of which we give too little attention. Changes come quickly in these days. Within comparatively recent times—it is not over a century—the American Republic has abolished the horror of slavery. It is only within recent times that the Married Women's Property Act made it impossible for a woman to hold and enjoy her own money and other possessions. Still more recently, as I have said, the franchise was conceded in Municipal elections. Now when the general woman suffrage Bill was enacted two years ago, as my honourable friend here pointed out, the vote was only given to women of thirty or over, and that was a deliberate decision as explained by the Speaker of the House of Commons, the object being to try the experiment in that way. Now the experiment seems to have resulted so satisfactorily that the Bill before the British Parliament at the present time contemplates what we understand as manhood suffrage, that is to say, a general twenty-one-year-old franchise. The experiment proved successful there; it was tried in Canada by what was known as the war-time election Bill, that provided a limited franchise whereby women who were relatives of men on active service were able to vote, and I think those who studied the question say that only by that means could the Canadian Government ensure the passage of a Conscription Bill at a time when Canada's failure to pass such an Act would have struck a very serious blow at the efforts of the Empire to win the war. I know of nothing in Canada's record that was more to the credit of the women of the country than that they should have supported the Government which was introducing Conscription and assisted in bringing about the passage of the Bill, which, as I see it, kept Canada in the struggle to the end of the war. We fortunately in this country did not need to proceed to such an extreme, but it was a case where the end justified the means. Now Canada has gone the full way. It has decided to give manhood suffrage to the women of the country, and if our neighbours on both sides of us are prepared to adopt that policy, I think we can make no mistake in following such a program. I therefore, Mr. President, have much pleasure in supporting the petition.

On motion the House went into Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act to provide for the better obtaining of Information Respecting the Cod-fishery."

Hon. Mr. McNamara in the chair.

HON. MR. SHEA:—The House is aware that this Bill is before us through the Select Committee, and we are asked to deal with it. There has been some change in the first clause and in the fifth, and a small change in the seventh.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—Mr. Chairman, is it at all possible for an exporter to expect to get fair play under such a clause as this (Sec. 5). The Minister of Marine & Fisheries is an exporter, a large exporter of codfish, and by giving him an insight into our mode of speculating in the staple industry of the country you are giving him a prior right to dispose of his codfish. I would not object to the totals being communicated to the Minister, but to give the quantity of each kind of fish would be to give him a right of disposing of his holdings to the prejudice of other people who held the same qualities. There is another Bill that has passed the Lower House which deals more drastically and gives a greater privilege to the Minister of Marine & Fisheries so long as that Minister is an export-

ing merchant, and I have no hesitation in saying that while this Bill would be prejudicial to the highest degree to the fair trade we have always enjoyed, the passage of the other Bill in its present condition which seems to have had a certain amount of unanimity in the other Chamber, will paralyse the business of the country. I disclaim any political bias or any political interest in the discussion that has taken place. I would be very easy to work a specious case out of the condition of the markets of Europe, it would be very easy to work out a specious case against the Government or against the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

HON. MR. SHEA:—You do not attribute the condition of the markets wholly to the regulations.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—Oh, no, c' course. My objection, to confine myself to the matter of the Bill, is that if I give an oath to the Minister of Marine & Fisheries, who is a large exporter of codfish, and will be a larger exporter of codfish this year, because other people will not export so much, if you give him that right, that privilege over all other exporters, you are destroying competition, you are destroying trade. I have no hesitation in saying that such a clause as that will give the Minister, or I should say the President of the Fishermen's Union, information that he ought not to possess, information that he can make use of in prejudice to those in competition with him, and will destroy the export trade of the country. I say this in all seriousness, as such a clause as that included in this Bill will be prejudicial and destructive to the interest of the country which we all have so much at heart. It will affect every Department of the economic condition of this country, and I beg honourable gentlemen to hesitate before they give effect to this clause No. 5. If they do so, I think the consequences will be so far-reaching and will precipitate such a condition of things that an early opportunity will have to be taken to remedy it. I could say much more, but my lips are closed with relation to a good many things, but I state here that such a power as that vested in a man who is a large exporter and will be a larger exporter, gives him a privilege which will be prejudicial to every one else and probably in the long run prejudicial to himself. I move that this section be expunged.

HON. MR. MILLEY:—Mr. Chairman, in this section here, I would like to ask the gentlemen in charge of the Bill why it is altered from 48 to 15 hours?

HON. MR. SHEA:—That was done at the suggestion of the Select Committee.

HON. MR. MILLEY:—Is there any objection to having their report read?

HON. MR. SHEA:—Oh no, but that was the result of the report.

HON. MR. MILLEY:—Was it unanimous?

HON. MR. SHEA:—With the exception of Mr. Grieve.

HON. MR. MILLEY:—I think it is the duty of the Select Committee to give the reason to the House why it has been altered. I would like to know the reason. I do not want to vote on a question of this kind without knowing whatI am voting for and why the alteration has been made.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—I can explain that. The paragraph as framed called for information to be furnished to the Minister of Marine & Fisheries on the 15th and last day of every month. It is not changed to monthly only, at the end of each month, or within 48 hours thereafter.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH:—With reference to the points raised

by the Hon. gentleman opposite, I must say I was much impressed by the strength of his argument at the last session, and that was the reason I suggested a Select Committee. We had the Minister meet us and we went into the question in all its details, and while unquestionably the point raised by the Hon. gentleman as to the Minister at present, or any Minister, is an exporter, yet the fact remains we have to face this question as we find it. And furthermore there is this point; there are 15 or 20 exporters along Water Street who are evidently sufficiently satisfied with this, to let it go, as they did not come before us. If they are not sufficiently interested to so come and ask to have it changed, then I do not think we should change it. That is my position. We have the Bill and we have to make the best of it. Possibly another Minister might be an exporter or might be connected with people who are. The gentlemen responsible for the conduct of affairs now feel that this legislation is necessary and if they think this is necessary for the success of the experiment they are undertaking for the betterment of the markets, then seeing that none of those interested object to it, I do not think we are called upon to make strenuous efforts to alter it. If it does not succeed, then the fault will be upon the heads of those who introduced it, and on the business people who did not come here to object to it.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—In February I combatted the proposed legislation and found myself opposed by a majority of the exporters of the Colony. Since then I do not go to the Board of Trade and do not take any interest in the proceedings of men who do not look after their own interests. Since then the Big Six have come round to my way of thinking, but I suppose are unwilling to admit it to a sense of shame, and are leaving the Opposition to some gentlemen in the Lower House or here. That is the position we are in now, but you are all intelligent men and in different walks of life, and if you apprehend no danger, then it is within your privilege and province to pass this. It will not affect me materially. I have taken my own precautions and if this passes, and other legislation foreshadowed passes, then I know exactly what I will do. But I am arguing on behalf of the Colony, and every interest of the Colony, merchants and exporters, importers, tradesmen and labourers; it affects them all and us all, if this measure is allowed, and if we are handicapped by legislation, by a law that will prevent me using my own judgment, limit me to sell at a certain price, limit me to exporting and disposing of my own produce. I do not agree with the Hon. gentleman who says that after you make a purchase it becomes the property of the Colony. I do not hold with any such theory as that. If you choose to pass this; if you choose to ignore Cassandra's voice, you do so at your peril. Troy fell when she did so, and this country may do so also. I say you cannot safely entrust to a man of the calibre of the Minister of Marine & Fisheries, who has a great many good points, and not a few bad ones, if you give him preference over the rest of the exporters.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—I presume this report is that of the Committee that sat upon the Bill, and that Committee, I presume, is interested in the Trade. If those interested in the business of the Colony are satisfied, then it is not for me to find fault. If this Bill is wanted by the Government and is necessary to safeguard the interests of the Colony then I am going to support it.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—We knew that.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—How did you know it? I want my Hon. friend to understand I am not here as a puppett manikin to rise and fall like a jumping jack at a pull of the string. If a committee comes in and reports it as a good bill I am going to support it. If it does not meet with the approval of the Committee then they should come to some understanding. But we have amendments to various sections, and I have my own views of it; every business man should have. However the position I want to take is, if the trade have agreed with the Government and the Minister with a deputation of the Trade are satisfied, then it has my support.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—There has been no deputation from the Trade, and you should not insinuate there was.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—I am insinuating nothing, but a deputation from the Lower House, and this House have agreed to the Bill, and it is the same thing.

HON. MR. MILLEY:—Re the amendment made by my Hon. friend, I would not like you to force that section this afternoon, and ask to have it stand over for another day.

HON. MR. SHEA:—Why?

HON. MR. MILLEY:—Well, for one not engaged in the fish business I want to vote honestly, and I am asking only a small matter for this section to stand over. In the past we have done so, and I think you should grant this request.

HON. MR. SHEA:—I have no objection to do so if the hon. gentleman will give some reason for asking it. The word "quality" was added in there at the request of the Select Committee who sat on the Bill. I do not want to force the Bill, but I think it only in reason to ask the Hon. gentleman for his reason in wishing the bill deferred.

HON. MR. MILLEY:—At the present moment I cannot give the reason. That is why I am asking to have this section stand over. There is no hurry; by the way legislation is going we shall be here until August. I would like to have some other gentlemen engaged in the fiish business give some light on this subject. I move the Committee rise and ask leave to report progress.

HON. MR. SHEA:—I am afraid I cannot accede to that request in the absence of any information from the Hon. gentleman. We have already had this Bill before the House, and referred to a Select Committee and given full consideration. Legislation is behind and we have bills coming up now and it is only right we should get through. I do not want to force legislation unduly, and if the Hon. gentleman will give some reason for postponing I should have no objections, but in the absence of any such information whatever, I cannot accede to the hon. gentleman's request.

HON. MR. MILLEY:—I am sorry my Hon. friend has taken that action. I do not think it was ever done in this House before, and I have been here for 16 years. The Select Committee come in with a report and we have a right to go into that report and into the Bill, and you are not giving us that right. This is a serious matter to this country.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—I think perhaps that the Hon. Mr. Milley is noticing only the insertion of the word "quality" in the latter part of that section. When the Bill first came before the House, the fish merchants were compelled to furnish to the Minister fortnightly the quantity of fish held in store with the various quantities for each market. But he

was not compelled to furnish to the President of the Board of Trade the same information. That was explained as being an omission, and it was intended to furnish the Board of Trade with the same information sent into the Minister with this exception; if say 40,000 qtls. of fish are held in store, so much for Brazil, so much for Italy or Portugal, or Spain, as the case may be. I will get a copy of the returns sent in too, and know there is so much fish, but I will not know how much Job Bros. have or Baine Johnstone have. The only difference is the Minister will know the different holdings and he is in honour bound not to disclose. Every exporter will know how much fish is held for the different markets, and with this information, the Bill was satisfactory to all, except Hon. Mr. Grieve, who opposes the Bill in toto.

HON. MR. GRIEVE—And in addition when the representatives of the Brazil houses acquire that knowledge and transmit it to their principals in Brazil I wonder what the value of a large stock of Brazil fish will be when the receivers to be will know we have an abnormal quantity of Brazil fish. The consequences will be, prices will fall and the Colony will suffer. Give them the aggregate if you will, but do not tell them we have 500,000 qtls. of Brazil fish when the total consumption is only 300,000. Do not give the whole thing away. You do not give your business away to everybody, but know you are going to advertise to all our buyers exactly what quantities of fish we hold and arming them against yourselves.

HON. MR. MILLEY:—I am not opposing the Bill, I wish that to be understood, but only wish more time to consider the section now under discussion.

HON. MR. SHEA:—I have no desire to force the Bill but only asked a natural question reply to his request to raise the committee, and if he gave any bonafide substantial reason, that would be another matter. It is far from me to want to force the Bill down the throats of Hon. gentlement. I have no desire to take any arbitrary course and am sorry I should be the first to break the Hon. gentleman's experience of 16 years in this House, because I amonly a novice here myself. I think I am only in reason in asking why you want me to do it.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—I assume the Hon. gentleman is only desirous of seeking some information that is not here.

HON. MR. SHEA:—If there is any expression of opinion on the matter I have no objections.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I was going to suggest the same as my Hon. friend. I gather he is desirous of getting some further information and may be able to make out a case. I would like to say—I have not been here all the session,—but since I came here the Hon. gentleman representing the Government has been most courteous and considerate in all his dealings with Hon. gentlemen.

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

Second reading of the Encouragement of Shipbuilding Bill was deferred.

Second reading of the Management and Control of Harbour of Grand Bank Bill.

HON. MR. SHEA:—Mr. President, this Bill entirely affects the management and control of the harbour of Grand Bank, and this legislation i in response to the request of the residents of Grand Bank. . I beg to move the second reading.

The Bill was read a second time

and ordered to be committed on to-morrow.

Hon. President read messages from the House of Assembly:

(1) Re passing Council's amendments re Posts and Telegraphs Bill, and Public Works Department Bill.

(2) Re passing following Bills, namely Legislative Disabilities and Vacation of Seats in the House of Assembly Bill; Act to provide for Lighting Streets in Outports; Act for Confirmation of a contract with the Susu S. S. Co.; Act re Stipendiary Magistrates and Justices of the Peace; Act to amend Death Duties Act; and Act concerning the registration of midwives, in which the concurrence of the Legislative Council is requested; also amendment of the Act re Fire Patrol.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea the following Bills were then read a first time and ordered to be read a second time to-morrow.

(1) An Act to Amend Chapter 4 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series), entitled "Of Legislative Disabilities and the Vacation of Seats in the House of Assembly."

(2) An Act to provide for the Lighting of Outport streets.

(3) An Act to amend chapter 86 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (third series) entitled "Of Stipendiary Magistrates and Justices of the Peace."

(4) An Act to amend chapter 27 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (third series) entitled "Of Death Duties."

(5) An Act concerning the Registration of Midwives.

(6) An Act for the Confirmation of a contract with the Susu Shipping Co., Ltd.

(7) An Act to amend chapter 137 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (third series) entitled "Of the Fire Patrol."

HON. MR. SHEA:—I wish to lay on table of this House a Report of Postal Telegraph Department.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea the House then adjourned until to-morrow 4 o'clock p.m.

THURSDAY May 27, 1920

The House met at 4 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea the Bills entitled respecting "An Act to amend the Judicature Act," and "An Act to provide for the Standardization of Codfish," were read a tihrd time, passed and sent to the House of Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same without amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea the House went into Committee on Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 172 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (third series) entitled "Of the Survey of Foreign-going and Labrador vessels."

Hon. Mr. Steer took the chair.

HON. MR. SHEA:—Honourable members will remember when this Bill was up before it was practically passed with the exception of Clause No. 4, and in clause No. 3, "Under penalty not exceeding one thousand dollars or three months imprisonment." The other clause on which there was some discussion was that with regard to survey. I may say the intention is more of a general inspection. Vessels going away, taking fish, should be subject to inspection. The Government is desirous of protecting the cargo. It is desirable to have an inspection or partial survey before each voyage. It is not intended to be an actual survey unless circumstances make it necessary. It is more in the light of

a general inspection of vessels; to have the power to have a survey if necessary. I hope this may be satisfactory to the gentlemen of this House who raised the question.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—There is no intention to inspect every vessel, but to have the power to do so?

HON. MR. SHEA:—They want to have the power in case such is necessary.

I move the adoption of No. 4 section.

Section 4 passed.

The Committee then arose and reported that it had passed the Bill with some amendments, and it was ordered that Bill be read a third time to-morrow.

On motion of Mr. Shea the House went into Committee on Bill entitled "An Act to provide for the better obtaining of Information respecting the Cod Fishery."

Hon. Mr. Winter took the chair.

Section 5 read.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—There is one point in connection with Section 5 on which I am not clear. After report is made to Minister of Marine and Fisheries no time is stated when intimation is to be given to Board of Trade.

HON. MR. SHEA:—It is assumed that information will be given in a reasonable time.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—I wish to move an amendment that 'and qualities' be deleted. We are investing the Minister of Marine and Fisheries with power which may be used to his advantage. It has come under my notice that a firm of twenty-five years standing—Messrs. Harvey & Co.—have a vessel loading at Belleoram, which has been denied clearance. In answer to an enquiry they were told that no clearance was given before June. On what grounds were they denied? At present there are two vessels loading at Port Union and one in St. John's. Are these to share the same fate as Mr. Harvey's vessel? This is giving the Minister of Marine and Fisheries a monopoly. We know very well secrets leak out, even executive secrets leak out. The amount of fish in different markets is known in Brazil and she buys cautiously and at the cheapest rate. I have the strongest objection to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries having the sole knowledge of what every merchant in the country holds, which enables him to dispose of his fish and leave other people with their stocks on hand and unsold. In resolutions that have been passed in the other Chamber there is a foresight of most arbitrary legislation which will prevent any exporter exporting without the authority of the Minister of Marine & Fisheries, and only exporting at a price named by the Minister and the fish must be sold before the vessel leaves the harbour. Now I think that is in contravention of all fair play, and I think we should not place in the power of the Minister of Marine & Fisheries, who is also an exporting merchant the power to do as he pleases and have exclusive knowledge of what every house in the trade holds and what he could quickly dispose of, with the advantage perhaps of a rise in the market. This is placing in the hands of a man in the trade the knowledge of what every other person in the business is doing, and for that sufficient reason I think that my amendment is in order and I press it to division.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—Mr. Chairman, I think if we keep on discussing this Bill the honourable member who has just sat down will be supporting it entirely. First when it was introduced into this Chamber he saw no good whatever in it.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—I beg your

pardon. You must not say that. I did not say I saw no good in it.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—Well, you objected to the principle contained in the Bill. Now the only objection is to giving the Minister information as to quality.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—Mr. Chairman I must protest. I shall have to ask the shorthand notes to be read. I did not at any time object to the entire Bill.

HON. MR| GIBBS:—I stand to correction, but I say the honourable gentleman opposed the principle underlying the Bill, that is, the giving of information to the Minister of Marine & Fisheries as to stocks of fish held by the fish exporters of St. John's.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—Only in respect of clause No. 5.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—Well, Clause No. 5 is the principal one in the Bill, and with that left out, it is useless. The honourable member must give other people credit for being as equally interested in the public welfare and the trade of the country as himself and should not think that all the wisdom connected with the trade and business of the country is centred in him. Other people see good in this Bill, and surely they must not be charged with uncharitable or improper motives. We have had gentlemen occupying departmental offices in this country before who were in trade and business where the invoices of goods and the prices for which these goods were purchased and the places where they were purchased and the places where they were purchased had to come before the Minister, and we have no evidence that any information obtained in his official capacity, even though he was engaged in trade and business similar to that of those who had to pass invoices before him, was ever made use of for his own personal and private ends, and we have no right to state, or even to insinuate, that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will make use of any information that he may obtain as to the quantity and quality of the stocks of fish that may be on hand in order that he may realize to the best advantage the stocks he has. I say it is not fair to insinuate that such a thing would be done. I say it is not fair to insinuate that such a thing would be done. If conditions were normal there would be a great deal in the objections of the honourable gentleman, but we must not forget the fact that abnormal conditions in every walk of the economic and industrial life of the country prevail to-day and will prevail for some years to come, and, realizing this abnormal condition of affairs, we have got to deal with them, we have got to face them, and there is no other way of facing these conditions and dealing with them except by legislation of this character. Every country in the world to-day is regulating its trade and its business. Why? Because of the abnormal conditions that have arisen in consequence of the War, because of the issues of paper currency, in the European continent especially, which has depreciated the standard and has influenced the price of goods to such an extent that the purchasing power of money has decreased in some cases 100 per cent, in some cases 200 per cent and in some 300 per cent. Now we are selling fish, the principal product of this country, to the poorest portions of Europe—Italy, Portugal, Greece and other places along the Mediterranean—and is it not right and fair that we should endeavour to regulate the terms and conditions under which we shall sell our goods, and is it not therefore necessary for the proper authorities to know the quantities and qualities

of fish that are in stock in order that they may regulate the sale and disposition of it according to the best interests of the country, because, after all, that is the object of this legislation. It is not for the purpose of making any individual or any firm or any class of individuals or companies rich, but it is for the purpose of benefiting the whole country, and as we have an abnormal condition of affairs prevailing in the world to-day, exceptional legislation must be enacted in order to deal with these conditions. If you want to find out the production of wheat in Canada there is nothing to prevent anybody in any part of the world learning that fact. If you want to find out what is the number of sheep on the hoof, what is the production of pigs or any other product in the United States or Canada you may get that information. That does not mean that there is going to be a depreciation in the price of the articles if a demand exists; the demand exists and this power to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is for the purpose of regulating the supply of that demand, so that where there are two or three exporters they may not ship large quantities of fish to the same place at the same time. Why should we not carry on trade and business in the same way as a business man in the United States or Canada deals with a man here. You cannot get flour or sugar or any other goods without contracting to pay for them. You know the price beforehand. But have not the fish exporters been sending off fish and taking what price they could get for it.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—Oh no.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—Well, some have to wait for six or nine months before getting paid. Is that a sound commercial policy? Is that the way business should be carried on? But, independently of that fact, Mr. Chairman, abnormal and exceptional conditions prevail in the world to-day, and it is necessary for the stability of the trade and commerce of this country that they be protected by some supervision and control of this character, and I have no doubt that that supervision and control will be exercised with discretion and that the things which the honourable member anticipates may happen will not befall us.

MR. ANDERSON:—Mr. Chairman, while in committee I would like further to add that in St. John's there are quite a large number of fish exporters. I do not know how many of them, but I understand that quite a large number, are in favour of this Bill, and that a very small number do not agree with it. If this House is to be the safety-valve to regulate legislation on behalf of the country, I think that we ought at least to listen to those who have given their opinion that this Bill in its entirety is a Bill worthy of support. Some little time ago in referring to the high cost of living we reviewed from this place the condition of the food market. Now the price of our commodites, especially when the commodity is an article of food, must be protected in some form or other. In this House we have two honourable gentlemen who are in this business, directly in the business. I refer to the Hon. Mr. Grieve and the Hon. Mr. Bishop. Others of us here are more or less indirectly acquainted or interested in the quality and the exporting of fish, and I would say again, Mr. Chairman, that there never was a time in the history of this country when greater care should be exercised in the quantity and quality of the fish which this country is producing. If the trade is satisfied to give this programme a trial, a fair trial, and entrust the Minister of Marine & Fisheries with the

necessary information, I think this is a measure worthy of trial. I know there have been times when people in positions of trust and responsibility in the Civil Service have violated their trust. It is unfortunate that people in business and trade should occupy these positions, and I hope that the time will come—I do not care what Government is in power—I hope the time will come when such will not be the case. In this Bill I have yet to find indications of any loss that the country is likely to sustain. It is worthy of trial, but I regret that some united effort was not made between the trade and that they could not arrive at some compromise in this matter. This Bill has passed the Lower House, I am told unanimously. I cannot recall at the present moment who are the honourable gentlemen in that House who are intimately identified with the trade, but they take upon themselves the responsibility for this measure. If there had been a request from the trade as a whole, or even the majority of the trade, to cut out the word "quality" I would be prepared to consider the amendment, but as when this Bill was up before us before it was referred to a Select Committee of seven and signed by six. one of the six immediately interested in the Bill, I am prepared to give it a trial.

HON. MR. MILLEY:—Mr. Chairman my reason in asking yesterday that this Bill be deferred was that I might get a little more information on this section, especially on the amendment proposed by my honourable friend, Mr. Grieve. This morning I interviewed as many as I possibly could of the fish exporters and every one of them would like to see the words "and quality" stricken out of the Bill. The Bill itself I am in favor of, and as this is a very small thing, to have these words stricken out, I think it is my duty to support the amendment.

On division the amendment was lost.

Committee rose and reported that the Bill had passed with some amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

On motion the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act to amend Chapter 176 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (third series) entitled 'Of the Encouragement of Shipbuilding.'"

Hon. Mr. Power in the Chair.

HON. MR. SHEA:—This Bill, Mr. Chairman, is one of the Bills sent to a select committee, and itwas reported on by that committee two or three days ago. Clause No. 2 in the original Bill has been stricken out and in substitution therefore there is a new clause which will now be read. (Clause read).

The Committee rose and reported that the Bill had passed with some amendment, and it was ordered that the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

On motion the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole on the Bill "An Act to amend Chapter 183 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (third series) entitled "Of the Management and Control of the Harbour of Grand Bank.'"

Hon. Mr. Browning in the chair.

HON. MR. SHEA:—This Bill, Mr. Chairman, speaks for itself. It will affect the control of the Harbour of Grand Bank and has been brought here by the people of that place.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—Before the passage of this Bill I would like to compliment the people of Grand Bank upon the stand they have taken in trying to improve their condition. So far as I can remember, this is the first time during my association with the House that a Bill of this kind has

come before us, where the people of an outport are making an effort to improve their condition and to tax themselves to improve their harbour and to pay salaries in connection with its management. I think the people of Grand Bank ought to be congratulated, and hope that whatever they take upon themselves to carry out will be a success.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—They have been doing this for years.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—I know, but this is the first time that I have had an opportunity of going through a Bill of this nature, and I trust that the people will be successful.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill passed without amendment. It was ordered to be read a tihrd time on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea, the following Bills were read a second time and ordered to be committed on to-morrow, namely:—Legislative Disabilities and Vacation of Seats in the House of Assembly Amendment Bill; Lighting of Outport Streets Bill; Stipendiary Magistrates and Justice of the Peace Amendment Bill; Death Duties Amendment Bill.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—I beg to move the second reading of the Registration of Midwives Bill. I may say in explanation that the practice of Midwifery has been carred on in Newfoundland somewhat surreptitiously and sometimes with fatal results. The practice of obstetrics is one of the most scientific in the practice of surgery, and a committee has been formed in the effort to improve matters. I shall move an amendment in Committee, and shall not say much to-day, but might observe that this matter involves human life, not alone one, but two are involved.

The bill was read a second time and ordered to be committed on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea, the Susu S. S. Co. Contract Confirmation Bill was read a second time and ordered to be committed on to-morrow.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—I beg to move the second reading of the Fire Patrol Amendment Bill. This Bill increases the grant to the A. N. D. Co. and the Albert Reed Co. for their section of the fire patrol on the railway line, from $4,000 to $6,500. Labor has increased and it has been found necessary to increase the grant.

Said Bill was then read a second time and ordered to be committed on to-morrow.

HON. PRESIDENT:—Read message from the House of Assembly announcing the passage of the following Bills; an Act to Check Profiteering; Act to amend the Income War Tax Act 1918; and requesting Council's concurrence.

Said bills were then read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

Hon. Mr. Shea tabled Report of the Minister of Agriculture & Mines for the year ending December 31, 1919; also Report of the General Hospital for the year ending December 31, 1918.

House then adjourned until to-morrow at four o'clock p.m.

FRIDAY, May 28th, 1920.

On motion the following Bills were read a third time and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message informing them that this House had passed the same with some amendments:

"An Act to amend Chapter 172 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (third series) entitled 'Of the Survey of Foreign-going and Labrador Vessels.'"

"An Act to provide for the better obtaining of Information respecting the Cod Fishery."

"An Act to amend Chapter 176 of

the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (third series) entitled 'Of the Encouragement of Shipbuilding.'"

On motion of the Bill "An Act to amend Chapter 183 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (third series) entitled 'Of the Management and Control of the Harbor of Grand Bank'" was read a third time and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message informing them that this House had passed the same without amendment.

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

Hon. Mr. Cook in the chair.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—I may say for the information of the honourable gentlemen that two Department of the Government have been created, the Department of Posts and Telegraphs and the Department of Education, and that it therefore becomes necessary that amendments be made to the Legislative Disabilities Act. This Bill provides that an amendment be made in Section 3 of Chapter 4. Sub-section 1 of Section 2 defines the persons who may respectively hold the offices. The amendment will therefore add two additional offices, the Ministry of Posts and Telegraphs and the Ministry of Education. The Ministers who are the heads of these Departments went to their constituencies as Minister of Posts and Telegraphs and Minister of Education respectively in the bye-elections of December last and were re-elected. In the general election they went as ordinary Opposition candidates, and, having been elected, they were appointed to these Departments, and it became necessary then for them to seek re-election at the hands of their constituents. They went back for election, and this amendment is for the purpose of confirming the action of the Government in creating these two Departments and confirming the position of these two gentlemen in the House. Section 3 deals with the Department of Shipping. Honourable gentlemen will remember that during the War it became absolutely necessary that a Department of Shipping be created and a Minister placed in Charge of that Department. The necessity for that Department's continuance very much longer is not apparent, and it is the intention of the Government to wind up the Department as soon as possible. The person who was appointed to that Department, Mr. Cave, could not hold office any longer than six months without vacating his seat As the Department will be wound up within a short time it is not fair, I submit, to ask the present occupant of the office to go back for re-election merely for the sake of a couple of months' continuance in the office. The object of the section, therefore, is to enable him to hold office until it is wound up finally, which must take place before the 31st of December next.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—In view of the contingency that tomorrow the Supreme Court may hold that Cave is not a member of the House of Assembly, where is the point of proceeding with this Bill this afternoon? I would suggest that the honourable member let it stand. At the same time would the honourable gentleman undertake to inform us how these two Ministers, the Minister of Education and Minister of Posts and Telegraphs, were appointed to these offices. I assume they were appointed by the Government, but I would like to know under what authority?

HON. MR. McGRATH:—Of course, that may be, but at the same time I presume there is some Minute of Council. You will remember that when the Department of Shipping was

created the authority for the Executive's making that appointment was the War Measures Act. Now while I can quite believe there is ample justification for the step the Government has taken in this matter, still I am not familiar with the procedure that was adopted. I know that in a parallel instance in England, when Sir Eric Geddes was appointed Minister of Ways and Communications—what we would call Minister of Railroads in this country—he was not appointed to that office until after a Bill for the creation of the office had passed the Imperial Parliament, and in the meanwhile he sat in the Executive as a Minister without portfolio. It is a proceeding of which I think it is desirable to have the facts related, because of course, while it is obviously possible for the Government to-day to create two departments by Executive authority, it is possible for another Government to create two others, and while the Legislature may ultimately validate that procedure, still I think it is just as well that we should know just exactly what was the procedure and the reasons why these persons were appointed at that time instead of waiting for three or four months until the Legislature created the Departments in the ordinary course and they were appointed Ministers in the ordinary way. I do not raise this point in a contentious spirit, but merely that we might have the facts in this regard. If the honuorable member could get the facts for the next meeting I would be obliged.

The Comittee rose, reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

The House went into Committee on "Outport Street Lighting Bill."

HON. MR. SHEA:—This Bill, as Hon. members will see, is to enable people in the outports at their own cost to provide for lighting. The cost of that light is to be procured by the imposition of a tax on coal paid into the revenue in lieu of revenue and will apply to any outport that choose to establish such a system.

Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs, the House went into Committee on the Stipendiary Magistrate and Justices of the Peace Bill.

Hon. Mr. Milley in the chair.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—The object of this Bill is to increase the jurisdiction of Stipendiary Magistrates, by granting them powers to try cases of carnal knowledge of persons under the age of consent if the person elects to be tried summarily.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—It is a very proper and reasonable amendment I agree, but I think our Magistrates should have some acknowledge of the seriousness of such cases. My attention was called some time ago to where a person guilty of rape was fined $20.00 or $25.00 by a Magistrate and let go at that, when he should have got three years.

The Committee reported the Bill without amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

House went into Committee on the Death Duties Amendment Bill, Hon. Mr. Winter in the chair.

HON. MR. SHEA:—This bill is brought in at the request of the Judges of the Supreme Court and is to provide for letters of probate being granted by Judges in Circuit which does not exist at present. Great dissatisfaction has been caused by people having to come on here to get that probate. It provides for bonds being given for the payment of Death Duties.

The Committee reported the Bill without amendment, and it was or-

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

House went into Committee on the Registration of Midwives Bill, Hon. Mr. Grieve in the chair.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—I may say that this Bill refers to a very serious matter. Ever since I have been practising, I think, I have seen valuable lives lost and people maimed for life through ignorance on the part of women practising Midwifery, and to try and correct that is some of the objects of this Bill. As I said on the second reading, the practice of Midwifery is a science. While there may be escapes from accident by amateurs in 99 cases out of a 100, in the other case there may be fatal accident to both mother and child. The object of this Bill is to have some control over Midwives, and the operation of the Act will be in the hands of an influential Committee both of men and women. Now it might cause hardship in certain people in outports where there is no doctor, so to cover that I propose the following amendment:—(read).

It is our intention to try and educate the midwives in outlying sections in the country in aseptics, in cleaning the hands and in the ordinary medical aids for the preservation of life. The Committee will take the matter in hands, and midwives will have to show certain qualifications and be registered in the Public Health Office or some other place. That is the object, and I think it a step in the right direction. It is done in every other country and we are only bringing ourselves up to date in passing this Bill.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH:—Might I ask is there registration for nurses generally at the present time.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—There is a Nurses' Association and they have registration of their own, and they are very strict and keep up the ethics of the profession. A nurse is not recognized as a trained nurse unless she has a certificate from a recognized school. Any other woman practicing midwifery is not considered unless she goes under our examination.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH:—Then they have no standing.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—No they are what Hon. Mr. McNamara calls the handy women.

The Committee reported the Bill with some amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

House went into Committee on the Susu S. S. Co. Contract Confirmation Bill, Hon. Mr. Shea in the chair.

HON. MR. SHEA:—This bill is to confirm a contract made by the late Government with the Susu S. S. Co. for a coastal steam service North. There are one or two slight alterations in the contract which have been accepted to the contractors, and which do not amount to much.

The Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment.

The House went into Committee on Bill entitled "An Act Concerning the Registration of Midwives."

Committee rose and reported it had passed the same without amendment.

It was ordered that it be read a third time to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea the House went into Committee on Bill entitled "An Act for the Confirmation of a Contract with the Susu Shipping Co., Ltd.

Hon. Mr. Steer took the chair.

Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment.

The House went into Committee on Bill entitled "An Act to amend Chapter 137 of the Consolidated Statutes

of Newfoundland (third series) entitled 'Of the Fire Patrol.'

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—In relation to this Bill I may say its object is to raise the present grant from four thousand to six thousand five hundred dollars. We have found that the wages of patrol men have increased, and the extra vote is therefore badly needed.

A grant was given last year for patrolling along the railroad. Last year seven thousand dollars was expended. Every year money is expended in fighting forest fires. This seems to be an unfortunate state of affairs. Notices have been posted in smoking cars not to throw lighted cigars or cigarettes out of the windows, and many other precautions taken. A large section of the country is now on fire, and a great deal of destruction is caused by these fires. Last year fourteen hundred fires were started. The purpose of this Bill is to increase the grant to enable this matter to be dealt with.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH:—Did you say fourteen hundred fires?

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—Yes, but two only, were serious ones.

The motion was carried.

Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment, and it was ordered that it be read a third time to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea the following Bills were deferred:—"An Act to amend the Income War Tax Act, 1918"; "An Act to Check Profiteering."

HON. MR. SHEA:—I wish to lay on the table of this House a copy of the Customs' Returns 1918-1919.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea the House adjourned till Tuesday 4.30 p.m.

Communication, from Mr. Withers, extending invitation to members to attend public educational meeting to be held in Methodist College Hall May 31st was read.

TUESDAY, June 1st.

House met pursuant to adjournment.

On motion the following Bills were read a thrid time and passed, and ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same, namely:—Act for Lighting of Outport streets; Act Re Stipendiary Magistrates and Justices of the Peace; Act Re Death Duties; Act Concerning Registration of Midwives; Act Re Confirmation of Contract with the Susu S. S. Co., Ltd.; and an Act re Fire Patrol.

House went into Committee on the Legislative Disabilities and Vacation of Seats Amendment Bill, Hon. Mr. Milley in the chair.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—In reply to information sought by Hon. gentlemen I may say that the Departments of Education and Posts & Telegraphs were authorised by Minute of Council a short while after the present Government assumed office, and Dr. Barnes and Mr. Halfyard were subsequently appointed to these offices respectively. Bye-elections were held after these gentlemen had vacated their seats, and they were elected by acclamation. They went of course as private members, but the constituencies were informed that they would be appointed for these departments, and it is for the purpose of confirming the action of the Government that this Bill is before the Chamber. Section three will of course be deleted from the Bill entirely, owing to the turn of affairs in connection with the District of Bay de Verde.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH:—The information is satisfactory so far as it goes, but would it be convenient to let us have a copy of the Minute of Council; that was really what I

asked for. I will be glad if he will do that before the Bill goes through the third reading.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—I am instructed to ask the consent of the House for the third reading to-day, and the Governor will be asked to assent to it to-morrow.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH:—This is unusual and objection could be very properly urged against it, and successfully so, because it is against the rules. Personally I do not object, but I would like to point out that on several occasions past objection was raised and I think we ought not overlook the fact that the right lies in any individual member to block the proceedings.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill with some amendments, and with the unanimous consent of the House, it was then read a third time and passed, and ordered sent to the Assembly with a message that the House had passed the same with some amendment, and requesting concurrence therein.

Hon. Mr. Gibbs moved second reading of the Income War Tax 1918 Amendment Bill, and said:—This amendment is to provide for a further allowance to married men with families.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—The amendment proposed here is for the purpose of making provision of two hundred dollars a year for each child under eighteen years of age. The honourable members who no doubt have been following the current literature will notice that in England and the United States there has been considerable agitation and discussion on this subject. Single men have no dependants and are in a far better position than married men who have to maintain families.

The next amendment which the Bill proposes is in sub-Section 10 of the Act. Sub-section 1 of the Act as it is now on the Statute Book has apparently not been working satisfactorily and amendments now proposed is that all that part of the section from "assessment" in Section 10 be stricken out and amendment in the Bill here substituted instead. So that if the tax when due be not paid, a penalty of 5 per cent instead of 7 per cent. be imposed with additional 1 per cent each month that it remains unpaid.

The honourable gentlemen who have to go through these phrases know just what is required. There is no material change in any other portion of the Act except "that penalty shall not be less than two dollars."

The first amendment is of material benefit to persons who have others dependent on them. I move that the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. MR. MEWS:—As one who is interested to some extent in the first section of the Bill I should be delinquent in my duty if I did not say I approve of this measure most heartily.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—Is this a Bill or are these resolutions? If these are resolutions it should be so stated, but this should come to us in the form of a bill.

HON. SIR P.T. McGRATH:—I had eyespotted this, if I may use such a term, a while ago. It is just another instance of the slipshod manner in which we do things in the other House. This is a Money Bill originating in the other House. These sections would then have to No. 1, 2, 3. No. 1 Reduce tax, etc.; Resolution No. 2 and Resolution No. 3. When it came to the Bill stage this would have been stricken out. Of course tomorrow when the Bill goes into committee we shall have to strike out section 3.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—Can this be deferred? The procedure is not correct!

HON. MR. McGRATH:—We can strike this out to-morrow.

Bill was then read a second time.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—I beg leave to refer this Bill to Committee of the whole House to-morrow.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—In moving the second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act to check Profiteering, I may say that honourable gentlemen know that the principal cause of discontent in the greater part of the world to-day is due to the high prices which prevail for the necessaries of life. There is a feeling existing in the minds of people that undue profiteering is going on. That there is good ground for this there is no doubt, in many cases but not in all. A great deal of criticism appears in the presses of the word and in our own local press. That profiteering has been going on, and is going on to-day is generally recognized. Some criticism is justifiable; all, however, is not. If people believe that profiteering is growing it is best to establish some Tribunal or Board whereby they may lay complaint and have investigation and if parties are guilty of making undue profit some penalty should be imposed. This Bill proposes that Food Control Board shall have power to investigate prices, costs, and profits at all stages, and for that purpose by order to require any persons to appear before them, and to furnish such information and produce such documents as they may require; and that this Board may have power to receive and investigate complaints. If a person makes a complaint that the profit made on any article is unreasonable he will be given an opportunity to be heard.

Section 2 of Bill provides that upon complaint being made that profit upon an article sold is of an unreasonable character that Board should investigate, and as Section 3 states, if as a result of investigation undertaken it appears to the Board that circumstances so require, proceedings shall be taken against the seller before a Court of Summary Jurisdiction; and if it be found that price charged was, in view of all the circumstances, unreasonable the seller shall be liable to fine not exceeding five hundred dollars, or in default of payment, to imprisonment for a term not exceeding three months. The next section, No. 4, is absolutely neces sary to enable Board to have orders carried out. If any person infringes an order of the Board he shall be fined one hundred dollars or in default of payment, imprisonment not exceeding one month. The next section is very desirable. If reckless statements are made knowingly—complaints against a person in trade made with a deliberate and set purpose—if statements are made without foundation—not bona fide—then the person making such statements shall be liable on summary conviction to a fine.

The next section deals with companies which may be convicted of offence under this Act. We cannot imprison a Company—the chairman, and every managing director and every officer shall be considered guilty unless he proves that the act took place without his knowledge. If, however, the managing director knew this sort of thing was going on and took no steps to prevent it then he would be considered guilty.

The next section makes the Board liable to costs if costs be against it.

In holding investigation the Board has power to require any person appearing before it or to whom it may nominate, to administer an oath. Section 10 deals with articles which

may be sold outside this country or by public auction or competitive tender.

The next section gives power to the Government in Council to establish committees having power to make regulations but not to fix prices, at other parts of the country other than St. John's. Bonavista or Twillingate or some place on the West Coast where persons are contending business is being conducted as it should not be and where unreasonable profit is being made. Committees would be able to investigate complaint made.

No member of the Board or any Committee shall be allowed to act if he is a trade competitor of those affected. The next section deals with persons who have goods to sell and refuse to sell these goods to complainants. The provision in the Bill prevents the seller from practising boycotting. A man who makes a complaint exercises his right in order to have his bona fide complaint investigated.

I move that the Bill be read a second time.

HON. MR. MILLEY:—To the gentleman in charge of this Bill I wish to read an article from the Journal of Commerce of Friday, May 21st. showing the criticism of the press on the Profiteering Act passed in the English Parliament. (The article was read).

HON. MR. MacNAMARA:—The average price of a barrel of flour before the war was eight dollars, the profit then was fifty cents. Flour is seventeen dollars to-day, to figure out the same rate of profit it will be about one dollar to-day. This clause just read states that the profit previous to War should not be deemed unreasonable. Seventeen dollars at fifty cents profit is very unreasonable. There is twice the money invested with half the profit. The same thing applies to other things, pork for example. Cartage and labour, which has greatly increased, has also to be taken into consideration. I think this clause should read "percentage of profit."

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH:—This Bill is only a transcript from the English Act passed two years ago in response to the agitation for some measure to deal with steadily increasing cost of necessaries of life. I have had some experience in dealing with the Local Food Control Board. A year ago there was some agitation here, and during the election (I speak personally, for I was made the target at that time) it was McGrath who made the people eat "brown sugar" and "hog feed." Some of the honourable gentlemen who were with me in the Food Control work will agree that profiteers were donounced vehemently. A change of Government it was thought would put an end to the profiteering. There was ample time for the new Government under the "War Measures Act" to make changes. I do not think this Bill will be heard of after it is once passed. Years ago a Bill was introduced dealing with rents. It went through all stages but nobody ever uses it. It is a dead letter.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—It has been pleaded in Courts in ejecting tenants.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH:—How often?

HON. MR. GIBBS:—Half dozen cases or more.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH:—I am glad to hear it. This meeting is utterly impossible to carry this Bill into effect. There is profiteering (if you will) everywhere. Everybody is profiteering. One man profiteers on the necessaries of life, another on his labour, and as we saw here the other day, when lawyers were enabled to double their fees.

The machinery needed would be too cumbersome. I may have some information to give to-morrow when the Bill goes into Committee.

But it was my duty during the time I was Chairman of the Food Control Board to give this matter a great deal of attention, and I think I am safe in saying that we worked out a system for dealing with the problem. We did not do any more than touch the fringe, because we did not have the time nor conditions to admit of our doing it, and in some cases the very people whom you would expect to support you were the very ones who gave you the strongest opposition. But with regard to the matter of this Bill,I think it can be demonstrated when we get into Committee that nobody knows what is going to be done and what will be the result, but I venture to say that nothing will be done if the Bill is passed, because it will soon be made manifest if anybody attempts to put it into operation that it will never cure the evils which it is intended to cure.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—Mr. President, following Sir Patrick McGrath's remarks that nothing will be done under this Bill if it is passed I think that the passage of this Bill should be assured because the apprehensions of certain business men as voiced by my friend, Mr. McNamara, will disappear. It strikes me that if everybody who makes more profit now than before the War is convicted under this Act, we might not be sufficient to form a quorum until their term of imprisonment had expired. I think we should define what profiteering is before we can intelligently discuss the Bill, but in my opinion it would safely be left to the Tribunal dealing with the matter to say what is fair and what is unfair profit. I do not think that there can be a very great deal of profiteering done in this country. Profits have automatically increased because of the increases in values in the source of supply. We must determine first what profiteering is before we can enact a law to punish people for profiteering, but I think a great deal depends upon the capacity of the Tribunal before which alleged profiteering is dealt with. First of all, determine what profiteering is before you make penalties. We must either do that or, what is still better, say that undue profit is punishable.

Hon. President read messages from the House of Assembly that they had passed the amendments made by the Council in and upon the following Bills without amendment: Encouragement of Shipbuilding Amendment Bill, Codfishery Information Bill, Survey of Vessels Bill, Standardization of Codfish Bill.

Hon. President read a message from the Assembly that they had passed the following bills, entitled respectively: An Act to Amend Section 9 of Chapter 139 of the Consolidated Stautes of ewfoundland (Third Series) entitled "Of the Encouragement of Agriculture"; An Act Respecting Certificates of Masters and Mates; An Act Respecting the Issue of Certain Debenture Bonds of the Colony; An Act to Regulate the Exportation of Salt Codfish; An Act to Amend 'The Business Profits Tax Act, 1917'; An Act to Authorize the Montreal Trust Company to do business in the Colony of Newfoundland; An Act to Amend Chapter 10 of 9-10 Geo. V. entitled 'An Act with Respect to Existing Tenancies and the Ejectment of Tenants Therefrom'; in which they requested the concurrence of the Council.

HON. MR. MEWS:—Mr. President, before the adjournment of the House, may I ask your permission to make a statement with reference to sugar.

In the interest of the people the Food Control Board have thought it advisable to take over the control of the sugar importations and fix a retail price at which it is to be sold all over the Island. During this year, the price has fluctuated from twenty to twenty-five cents, being sold by some at as high a price as twenty-eight cents.

By an arrangement between the Trade and the Food Board the retail price has been kept at about twenty two cents for more than a month, a circumstance which has saved the people not less than forty thousand dollars, as without that arrangement sugar would probably have been sold generally at twenty-five cents and perhaps more.

Stocks of sugar sufficient to supply our needs for the next two months were secured at a reasonable price, but the market price was continually advancing, and sugar was bought at length by importers for fall requirements, at prices that would mean sugar at forty cents a pound. Dealers in sugar intimated to the Board that they did not feel like buying sugar at this high price, unless they could protect themselves by an advance on sugar, which they were selling at present. Just at this time the Board had an offer of one thousand tons of sugar at a price which was considerably below that for sugar which would have been sold at forty cents.

This lot was acquired and the Board thought it a favourable opportunity to make a pool of the sugar to arrive, which involved a quantity which will more than supply our needs for the balance of the year.

Arrangements have been made to take over all undelivered contract, and all sugar to be imported, and an average price has been arrived at, a price which, if no extraordinary circumstances arise, will remain in force for the balance of the year. This retail price is fixed at thirty cents per pound, and this price must be considered a satisfactory one in view of the fact that it costs very near that figure to bring sugar in the country at the present time.

The Board felt it was in the interest of all, that this average price should take effect at once, because it would be a manifestly unfair position that would allow those with money to purchase large stocks of sugar at cheap prices and leave those who can only buy from week to week to pay forty cents a pound for sugar in September and the months following.

While there may be temporary breaks in the sugar prices, it is felt by all the authorities on the sugar situation that the price will show no decrease for this year, and under these conditions the Food Board have felt that they have done the best for the country in taking over the sugar business.

They felt that with such an essential commodity as sugar, at such a high price, the public must be protected. Competition in sugar has been eliminated this year; supplies have been short, and opportunities to make large profits were such as never before presented themselves to those dealing in sugar. The Board can reasonably say that now the public know the worst as regards sugar prices, and as has been said, unless extraordinary circumstances intervene, we need not anticipate a future increase for many months.

The House adjourned until Wednesday, June 2nd.

WEDNESDAY, June 2nd, 1920.

House met at 4 p.m.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House went into Committee on Bill en-

titled "An Act to amend the Income War Tax Act, 1918."

Hon. Mr. Steer in the chair.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—Mr. Chairman, last section is either a clerical or a printer's error. I move that last section be stricken out.

HON. P. T. McGRATH:—I meant to deal with this. We could strike out the sub-section, which would send it back amended or we could suspend further proceedings and have Government members of Lower House informed and ask them to send Bill back again to be dealt with anew. Personally I think the simplest way would be to strike out the section. As everybody understands I do not think there will be much difficulty. Let the Bill be amended and then it can go down to Lower House.

The Committee rose and reported having passed same with an amendment, and Bill was ordered to be read a thir dtime to-morrow.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the Committee on Bill entitled "An Act to Check Profiteering" was deferred.

Second reading of Bill re Agriculture.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—In moving the second reading of Bill entitled "An Act to amend Section 9 of Chapter 139 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Encourage of Agriculture," I may say that in the Committee stage I shall go into this more fully. The Bill asks a change of grant—to increase the Model Farm grant from twenty to thirty thousand dollars—a difference of fifteen thousand over previous years. Up to 1914 the grant for agriculture was forty thousand then it was cut down to twenty thousand. When Bill reached Committee stage I shall dwell at some length on it.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Could we have Agricultural Report?

HON. DR CAMPBELL:—It was tabled a few days ago.

The Bill was then read a second time.

On motion the Bill was referred to whole House to_morrow.

Second reading of Bill respecting Masters and Mates.

HON. MR. SHEA:—In moving the second reading of Bill entitled "An Act respecting Certificates of Mates and Masters," I may say this is a measure to meet present requirements. There are quite a number of ships at present without masters. There is a difficulty in finding masters and mates. The idea is to appoint a Board of Examiners consisting of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Harbour Master, and Sir John Crosbie, to grant certificates. There is a great difficulty in finding masters and mates owing to war conditions. The Bill asks that Board have power till January 1921. This is just a temporary measure.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—I have no objection to the principle of the Bill. There are matters in connection with it, however, which are peculiar. Regarding the necessity for Bill as pointed out—something in that connection is necessary at least as far as masters are concerned—as regards mates I am not so sure. It will be noticed that it is a temporary measure and discontinues at the end of this year. If it is to be of any benefit there is not much time for persons to receive their certificates and then avail of the advantage. It is apparent to members of the House it cannot apply to masters at the present time. But few are in the port of St. John's at present.

As to the personnel of the Committee proposed—'The Board of Examiners shall consist of Minister of Marine and Fisheries' (this is quite proper—not the Hon. W. F. Coaker)—the Harbour Master of the port of St. John's and the third member Sir John Cros-

bie.' It is peculiar that he is named as a member of this Committee when it is known that Sir John Crosbie is now on his way to Europe. How long his visit is to last we do not know. Other members cannot act in his absence so what benefit is this Bill to be? and the men it is intended to assist must remain until the return of Sir John Crosbie. Such I submit is the position of affairs if the Bill is put through in its present form. The Board is first to lay down rules and regulations. That is their first duty, and that cannot be done in an hour. It is not my intention to speak at any length upon the Bill at the present moment, but it does strike me that it is a curious Bill in its present form, and I cannot understand why it does not provide that a third member may be nominated by the Governor in Council, and then in the absence of Sir John Crosbie they would have the power to provide for somebody else to go ahead in his absence. There will be some men arriving week by week, but none can avail of it, and those that are here will be out of port in a week or two and so will others. I do not think, Sir, that any benefit or gain will be derived by the passing of the Bill in its present form.

HON. MR. TEMPLEMAN:—Mr. President, I take this opportunity of speaking on this Bill. I think it is nonsense to talk of such a Bill, because many of us know many of the captains of ships and know that most of them have come up from the lowest rung of the ladder and have to be congratulated upon it. Our men have done as well as men with certificates, and a great deal better. I do not see what is the meaning of this Bill. I think the Lower House must want something to do, and so they brought uo this Bill. I agree with all Mr. Bishop said about it. It is only going to cause inconvenience to the trade of the country to look for men with certificates, and how long it is going to take a man to get a certificate I would like to learn. I have vessels and have men go across with cargoes of fish, and the men have no certificates but they do just as well and better than the men with navigation. When a ship goes down, we blame the captain, but it is often because of the ship. Give a man a good ship and he will bring her across, but when you give him a shell, why then it has got to go down. It is not the captain's fault; it is the fault of the ship, and some of the men who brought in this Bill built some of the rotten ships. I agree with all Mr. Bishop said. I hope the House will not pass this Bill.

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH:—Could the honourable gentleman who is in charge of the Bill let us have some information as to the number of men who will be affected? I understood it was something over one hundred, as I am informed that there are over a hundred vessels that there would be difficulty in getting masters for.

HON. MR. SHEA:—I am informed that there are about two hundred and fifty or three hundred men in sight. I would suggest that we let the second reading go through and any information that can be procured I shall be glad to get when we are in Committte.

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

Second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act respecting the Issue of Certain Debenture Bonds of the Colony."

HON. MR. SHEA:—This Bill is rendered necessary because of the fact that in some of the debentures that were issued under the Loan Act of 1919 it transpired that the signatures of Sir Michael Cashin and Mr. Bennett to these deventures were affixed after they had ceased to occupy office, and it

is in order to remove all doubts as to the validity of these debentures that this Bill is introduced. I beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

The Bill was then read a second time, and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

Second reading of Codfish Exportation Bill.

HON. MR. SHEA:—In moving the second reading of this Bill I would say that the principle of the Bill is to create a Codfishery Exportation Board which would consist of seven members: the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Chairman; four members appointed by the Governor in Council who shall be licensed exporters of codfish and two members appointed by a majority of the exporters of codfish. The principle of the Bill is the regulation of the exportation of codfish from this Colony to the foreign market. I do not think there can be very much question as to the principle of the Bill, that is, the regulation of the exportation of codfish, whatever questions there may be with regard to the details of the working out of these regulations, and on these grounds, Mr. President, I would ask the second reading of this Bill. When we go into Committee, of course, we would be prepared to go into particulars and take up each paragraph.

HON. MR. RYAN:—Mr. President, I wish to say a few words on the Fishery Regulations which were put in force last October and November. I have just returned from London, and while there I had several interviews with Messrs. Hawes & Co., and got from them some figures as to the quantity of Newfoundland fish held in Spain by them up to the 28th of April.

Mr. Hawes then had his stores filled, and his sales were very small, which no doubt was caused by the regulation prices then in force, viz.:—85/— for Labrador and 90/— for Shore, while our competitors, the Norwegians and French were supplying the market and selling freely at from 10/— to 15/— per quintal under our prices for the Newfoundland fish. In fact sales of Labrador fish were practically stopped.

These are the sales given me by Mr. Hawes for the four weeks in April:

Sales Labrador	Qtls.
1st week	100
2nd week	512
3rd week	none
4th week	350
	962

Sales of Shore for 4 weeks	Qtls.
1st week	1800
2nd week	1700
3rd week	1400
4th week	2500
	7400

Mr. Hawes had in his stores in Spain on May 1st:

Labrador fish	18,675	Qtls.
And on passage about	8,000	"
Making a total of	26,675	"
S. fish in store same date	40,000	"
And on passage about	17,000	"
Making a total of	57,000	"

The figures will show you the quantity of fish held in Spain by Hawes & Co., but had Mr. Hawes reduced his prices to 75/— or 78/— no doubt he would not have his stores blocked as they were. He had to meet competition, and he should have been given a free hand to sell the fish at his own discretion and let it go into consumption, instead of piling it into his store at the expense of the shipper.

At the wind up of this fish business the shippers will have to pay storage, fire insurance, handling, etc., and loss in interest, and no doubt the deterioration in weight of from fifteen to twenty per cent. This was always about the

shrinkage, (it may be more or less). I am of opinion sir, that of the fish shipped from Newfoundland since the first of January, that when the shippers get their account sales for this fish next November and December that many of us will have cold feet. I am glad to learn that many shippers have changed their opinions now about the Fishery Regulations from what they were last fall. Fixed regulation prices for fish or any other produce will not work when you have competition to face, and we have more competition in the fish trade now than ever known before.

It was always the custom with the London brokers to advance seventy-five per cent (75%) cash against shipments of fish on receipt of bills of lading to any person who wanted money. Mr. Hawes did the same last fall and early winter, but whatever has happened now he will not advance a cent on any shipment, cargo or parcel.

Mr. President, we all know the cost by sad experience of storing fish in foreign countries to be retailed as against an outright sale. No man of experience will consign if he can make an outright sale, but if a company enters into building stores for that purpose, why surely they don't want to make outright sales, because it may pay them better to store and retail their goods.

The result of consigning fish has always been bad, and my experience is never do it if you can sell outright even at a loss. I hope the Government will abandon any regulation of prices for sale of codfish abroad, but enforce a strict cull this year so that the man who makes good fish will get paid for it, and the fellow who makes bad fish will get paid accordingly. In the past there was no encouragement for the making of good fish, because the talqual system killed it, and the bad fish sold at about the same price as the good. The war is over, and every country is now catching codfish. We must compete with them as to prices in the foreign markets, or our fish will not sell. We cannot afford to put our fish in store now in Spain, Italy, Greece or Portugal, and keep a fixed price on it. We should sell it outright, and let every man sell his own goods, and not be muzzled with regulation prices, it will never work.

HON. MR. TEMPLEMAN:—Mr. President, I have been dealing with fish for years. We have the same old story—Let the Government enforce a strict cull. Mr. Ryan knows as well as I do that no Government will bring in a strict cull. They are not so foolish as that. Now I am surprised that Mr. Ryan thinks that any Government is going to impose a strict cull. Mr. Ryan and I have slaved time and again to get members elected, and for what, so that they may get jobs for themselves. Last year during the elections I attended to my own business, and I should have done that long ago. Everybody is talking about the regulations and what the Government is going to do. I must quote some Scripture, though I don't suppose we give much heed to that now: "A house divided against itself cannot stand." We have talked about the fish regulations in the papers and everywhere, and the people away think that we have enough fish to supply them for the next twenty years. The man who makes flour in Canada cares a lot about our having fish to sell. Instead of getting together and forming regulations ourselves, the Government has had to form them, and we are all fighting together about them. I think this country has had enough of politicians, and we ought to think about our duty generally and not think about the regulations. Let us be one on what is right and proper and not be fighting one another. Mr. President, I think all this

talk will damage us. Coming back to the regulations, I think myself the regulations are good, but all the lies talked about fishery matters naturally reached other countries, and the people say, "We needn't worry about fish; we can get loads from Newfoundland any time we want it." Why do we not get together and agree on reasonable regulations to enable us to market our fish. And then again, why should we send to Spain a lot of fish not fit to throw overboard, with the result that a man who has good fish has got to sacrifice it? I have been shipping fish for years, and every cask I send over is A1, but the rotten fish that goes over to the other side spoils our markets.

HON. MR. RYAN:—I am sorry I cannot agree with my honourable friend from Bonavista in all he has said about the culling of fish, about the regulations and all that sort of thing. He does not know whether it is good or bad. I am sure he is fully aware that the cull of fish until a few years ago was good all round; then some commenced to take fish talqual, and this has resulted disasterously to the fishery interests of the country. Every man now in the outports all round the Island is trying to make as bad as he can, because if John or Thomas or Henry take pains to cure his fish well he gets no more than the man who scarcely spreads it for an hour. He puts it out for half a day and then brings it to Mr. Templeman or somebody alse and says it is the best fish, and the merchant will take it because everybody wants to handle all the fish he can. I am sure the Government has a good motive in these regulations with regard to cull, and as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is deeply interested in the fishery he will insist upon having a stricter cull. I am insupport of regulations with respect to the cull of codfish. As regards the regulation prices, they were alright, so far as I know, up to a certain date, but when the Norwegian and French insisted upon on putting fish into Spain and other places against ours, the regulations should have been lifted at once and Mr. Hawes, who had charge of most of the fish from Newfoundland, should have had a free hand to sell the codfish he held and compete with those other men and not allow his fish or our fish from Newfoundland to rot, as some of it is doing now in Spain.

HON. MR. TEMPLEMAN:—There is no good fish rotting .

HON. MR. RYAN:—There will be a great deterioration in the fish which Mr. Hawes has over in Spain and there will be insurance, labor and other charges and the quicker that fish sells, the better, and I am surprised that people in Newfoundland in this combine, so to speak, do not give Mr. Hawes a freer hand to sell the fish. At the time I was in London, Mr. Hawes was suffering greatly; he was a sick man and this fish was on his mind. He had his stores filled and could not sell his fish, while the other people were selling it freely. Hon. Mr. Templeman said he did not know whether the regulations were good or bad, but I know they were bad as soon as French fish came in Mr. Hawes should have had a free hand.

HON. MR. TEMPLEMAN:—Who bound Mr. Hawes' hands?

HON. MR. RYAN:—You know that. You heard tell of the Big Six last fall. You were not on the ground floor, but on the roof and ought to know who bound Mr. Hawes' hands.

HON. MR. TEMPLEMAN:—Hon. Mr. Ryan talks about the cull of fish. Well I am 60 years of age and Mr. Ryan is about 70. I suppose he has been handling fish since he was a boy, and so have I. He knows that the late Mr. James Ryan and D. A. Ryan took in many a hundred quintals of slimy

fish for No. 1 Merchantable, and I can swear to it.

HON. MR. RYAN:—That was to take it away from you.

HON. MR. TEMPLEMAN:—That was before I was in business at all, and helped you to make a lot money which you could not make now, because you had a lot of honest men then.

HON. MR. RYAN:—Are we not all honest men? Have you ever met a rogue?

HON. MR. TEMPLEMAN:—Hon. Mr. Ryan brought up the question of cull. Now I know the difference between a salmon and a codfish, and between a herring and a caplin, but there are some men sent out from this town now to buy fish and they do not know West India from Madeira, or Cullage from Merchantable. I have turned away thousands of quintals and wish I had turned away thousands more. The cullers are the same as forty years ago, and in fact do not know as much about fish now as then. Where is the Government going to get cullers; experience men who know a codfish from a caplin, and when they do know are independent enough to say which is which. I have been at it for 40 years and cannot get them. I have two and they know too well and are not allowed to cull at all. I should like to see the Government tackle the thing, but am afraid they will not. It is not the cull that requires mending, it is the handling of the fish after it is caught, so that we wont be sending rotten fish to market. I have fish over there that I am not ashamed of, but unfortunately we have a lot of rotten shippers who send over fish not fit to eat. Some of them will get hurt, and I hope they do; but unfortunately I will get hurt with them. Then you get schoolboys shipping fish and flooding the markets and when that happens I think it is time for the Government to take a hand, and prevent that and prevent any but experienced men from shipping fish. How many cargoes are over there now from the West Coast, from people who never shipped a good fish: West India shipped for Large Merchantable, and I can swear to what I say, and I can bring witnesses to prove it too. The Government will have its hands full. I hope they will do something to compel people to handle fish as an article of food and not as if it was manure.

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

On motion the remaining Orders of the Day were deferred.

HON. PRESIDENT read message from the Assembly that they had passed the following Bills in which they asked the concurrence of this Chamber, namely, An Act to amend Chap. 35 of the Consolidated Statutes entitled of the Postal and Telegraph Service, and An Act respecting the Preservation of Beavers.

Said Bills were read a first time and ordered to be committed on to-morrow.

House then adjourned until Friday next at four o'clock.

FRIDAY, June 4th, 1920.

House met at 4.00 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Gibbs the Bill "An Act to amend the Income War Tax Act, 1918," was read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly, with a message intimating that the Council had passed the Bill without amendment.

On motion the House went into Committee on the Bill "An Act to Check Profiteering." Hon. Mr. McNamara in the Chair.

HON. MR. STEER:—Mr. Chairman:—Before this Bill is taken up section by section, I would like to make a few remarks concerning it, and I would begin by criticizing its very title. An act to check profiteering would presup-

pose that profiteering had been going on to a greater or lesser extent for some time, and this I very much question, in spite of all that has been appearing in sections of the daily Press for some time.

There may have been at times, an extra profit made on beef, pork, flour, sugar or other speculative articles, which are subject to continued fluctuations in price, but such profit obtained on any one article has only served in most cases to offset losses made on other goods of the same class.

Lloyd George, in the British House of Commons in February last during the debate on the Address in Reply from the Speech from the Throne stated that any one, who said that the present high prices were due to profiteering, either was ignorant of the facts or was wilfully deceiving the public, and in my humble opinion he only stated what was true.

The Bill before us does not give any definition of profiteering and, therefore, we are more or less in the dark as to its intention, but we are justified to a certain extent in presuming that its intention is to limit the profits made on any one particular article, and I maintain that such is preeminently unfair to the general trader who, as I have already pointed out, whilst he might be making an extra profit on one particular article, at the same time may be making an extra heavy loss on two or three other lines of goods. In fact, we have had a typical example of this during the past few months for whilst an extra profit has been made on sugar (and not a very great one at that) heavy losses have during the same time been incurred on porks and beefs amounting anywhere from $6.00 to $10.00 per barrel and possibly more in some cases. It, therefore, seems to me that the average profit made by any particular firm can be the only criterion by which you can decide as to whether or not that firm has been profiteering.

Again, Mr. Chairman, in section 3 if we read the last paragraph "Provided "that a rate of profit which does not "exceed the fair average rate earned "by persons in the same way of busi-"ness as the seller upon the sale of "similar articles under pre-war condi-"tions, shall not be deemed unreason-"able," we have no clear definition what may constitute a reasonable or unreasonable profit, although we have here mentioned pre-war rates as a guide, but it does not state whether it is to mean rate per lb. or single article, or percentage rate. If the former, it is manifestly absurd, as I will endeavour to show. Take the item sugar for instance as an example which when costing say 6c. per lb. would possibly have been sold at 7c. showing a gross profit of about 14% (what the nett profit on this would be it would be hard to estimate).

I might have made it cost 5c. per lb. and sell at 6c. and so made it show an increasing percentage of profit but I do not wish to exaggerate the case in providing my point.

It would be manifestly an injustice to those concerned in handling sugar, and would I think possibly in many cases lead to retailers refusing to handle sugar at all, were it to be enforced that because sugar was sold at a gross profit of 1c. per lb. when costing 6c., it should have to be sold at a profit of less than 2c. per lb. when costing over 28c., in the former case returning a profit of about 14% and in the latter only about 4%.

If you take into consideration the fact that all cartage, labour, wages and overhead expenses have gone from between 100 to 200%, the trade is perfectly justified in looking for at least the same percentage of profit, and then they are not netting as much as they did before.

I would, therefore, propose that when we come to section 3, last paragraph, the words "Per Centage" should be inserted (as an amendment) between the words "Average and Rate," making it to read "Fair average percentage rate."

Just one other matter Mr. Chairman, and then I have done. Take the first clause in the Act and section 10.

It seems to me there is a great discrimination here; under the first clause, the producer, handler, distributor for home consumption is to be controlled and penalized, whilst under section 10 the producer, handler, and distributor for exportation is free to get whatever prices he likes. Codfish, herring, canned salmon, lobster, rabbit, produced for home consumption may have prices regulated, but the same articles for export may be profiteered in to the utmost limit. It may even happen that under the able leadership of the present Minister of Agriculture and Mines, we may within a short period have vegetables and cattle to export; would these consumed locally have prices restricted whilst those exported be absolutely free from all control.

Take the Act as a whole, as to whether it is to prove a benefit or otherwise, all depends upon the way it is carried out by the Food Control Board. It may prove a benefit and possibly restrain enigmatical profiteering whilst it may also be the means of perpetrating rank injustice on a certain section of the community, notably the small retailer (and in fact the larger merchant) for while owing to the increased cost of living wages of all classes have advanced so considerably, yet although the cost of living of the distributor has gone up in an equal proportion as well as all overhead expenses, he may not be permitted by the Act to make any increased profit to offset this, which may result in a bankruptcy.

But with the personnel of the Board such as it is with possibly one or two additional, (so that all classes affected may be represented), we can I hope feel reasonably assured that the interest of all concerned will be fully conserved, and that no one section of the community will be penalized at the expense of another.

SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Before we proceed further with that section, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the honourable gentleman who is Chairman of the Food Control Board if he would give us some information as to what steps, if any, the Board has taken to keep prices within control. If there any article at present under control, apart from sugar; I understand sugar is under control.

HON. MR. MEWS:—The only article under control of the Board is sugar.

SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Has any other article been under the control of the Board since it took office?

HON. MR. MEWS:—No only flour.

SIR P. T. McGRATH:—That is not so much control as regulation. Are you exercising any control over the price?

HON. MR. MEWS:—No absolute control.

SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Are you exercising a contingent control?

HON. MR. MEWS:—In a general way we are watching and know what is going on.

SIR P. T. McGRATH:—But you have no machinery in operation, is that not so? Are you controlling butterine: Have you any control over the price of butterine? or of hard biscuit?

HON. MR. MEWS:—In relation to butterine I may say that one of the factories here is merely keeping itself above water and we found we could do nothing to control the price or make it less. We are not controlling the price of hard biscuit.

SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Then it comes down to this, Mr. Chairman, that the Board of Food Control as we have it now is exercising no control whatever except as regards the matter of sugar which has been dealt with during the last few days. The Board consists of five members. Our Board consisted of three. It is within the knowledge of various gentlemen here that during the time we were working, we, by virtue of conferences with importers of various articles, and by the exercise of the powers which the existing law gave us, were able to exercise, and did so, control over various articles I spoke of. We restricted profits on all these articles and we required the dealers in them to satisfy us as to the justice of their claims for an increase in the prices before allowing any such increase to be made. I do not want to strain the position because it is familiar to everybody, but we were and myself particularly, denounced most vehemently for our failure to check profiteering and reduce prices. Now the hon. gentleman who last spoke questions whether there was any profiteering. I would like to point out to the Manifesto of the Hon. Prime Minister was very strong on that point. He said (extract).

Well now, the House has been in session for six weeks and we are only dealing with the matter now. I pointed out the other day that the Government, if disposed, could have dealt with this matter long ago under the War Measures Act. In proof of that I would cite the fact that yesterday's Gazette announced certain regulations respecting the cost of salt, limitinfi the price to be charged. Now what is the position to-day? I would not speak so strongly about this, but I am sure hon. gentlemen will understand that I feel strongly on the matter in that I was singled out as a target for 90% of the denunciation directed against the Food Board, one member of which was I might point out, a member of the F. P.U., Mr. Geo. Grimes, and I would like to say here that a more zealous, conscientious colleague I have never hay anything to do with in all my ex_perience. Mr. Steer asked for the definition of a profiteer: Well I do not know, but I do know the definition under the English Bill, given by Sir Auckland Geddes, now Ambassador at Washington, which is as follows: (Read).

And he touches on the very point the hon. gentleman made because it excludes from the purport of the Bill transactions in the export trade. One of the gravest charges made with regard to profiteering in the Old Country was against Coates & Co., the famous thread manufacturers in Parsley, who increased the price to something like 10d. a reel. Coates' defence is that they have been selling the article to the British commoner at the veriest margin of profit and the enormous profit realized has been made by profiteering on the unfortunate outsider. The same exists regarding tobacco. The British Government appointed a Committee to investigate into tobacco and other articles, and at its head put Sydney Webb, one of the leading economists in the British Isles, and they reported that the Imperial Tobacco Company had used control of 60% of the domestic trade to keep prices down and quality up, and nevertheless made £4,560,000 profit on the prices charged to outsiders. Now I do not develop that point to claim that it is just to profiteer at the expense of the foreigner, but that is really what everybody is doing: That is the root fact of our fishery legislation we are bringing in here to_day. As to whether there is profiteering in this country at present is a matter of which there are various opinions. I may say as a result of my two years experience that attempts

were made. Some very flagrant cases were brought to our notice but the difficulty was to get somebody to come forward and give evidence. A magistrate in an outport made a complaint to the people accused. They supplied an explanation which reached us at a time the magistrate came here on a visit. I asked him to come in and he immediately backed down. He did not want to get into any trouble with his neighbours and the result was we could go no further. My personal conviction is this Act will never be availed of, and no prosecutions will be initiated. I can sympathize with the point of view of the hon. gentleman across the floor. He was a member of one, if not more, Committees representing the dealers in food stuffs that worked with us in the old Food Board and I think he will admit we tried to do the square thing by all. Sometimes people were hit hard, but I think on the whole in dealing with a difficult subject we managed to hold the balance fairly even. Another hon. gentleman appointed was connected with the manufacture of articles we had to take under our purview, and I think he will say the same. If I may be allowed to say so without offence to the hon. gentleman who succeeded me, the Food Board to-day is not functioning. With the exception of sugar, which when action could be no longer postponed, nothing has been done to control prices. I think if the Board were to take up the matter of regulating prices as we did up to last year there would be more satisfactory results to the general public than by passing such a Bill as this.

HON. MR. MEWS:—Might I ask did freight rates come down while you were investigating conditions?

HON. SIR PATRICK McGRATH:—No, but we compelled the railway and steamer companies to come before us and submit the costs of running the same and give all information we considered necessary.

HON. MR. MEWS:—Of course it would be hardly fair for us to take credit for the fact that to-day rates are going down. I know from our own operations that rates are going down.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Do you claim that rates are down compared with what they were on the first of April?

HON. MR. MEWS:—That to my information.

HON. MR. STEER:—The last speaker, Hon. Sir P. T. McGrath, made reference as to what is being done as regards hard bread and butter. I may tell him for his information that the public are getting the benefit of competition to such an extent at practically cost. As far as butter is concerned the factories are doing so badly that one of them went into insolvency.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—The hon. gentleman says the people are getting the benegt through competition in hard bread. That is not creditable to the Food Board. My position is that the manufacturers of hard bread were never allowed to increase the pirces until after they had submitted figures showing the cost of production, and we did not permit so great an increase as asked for.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—Will you please enlarge on the hard bread, as I am particularly interested.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I would be quite willing to have the hon. gentleman state the position as he is better acquainted with the facts.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—As we are on that perhaps the history of the hard bread business might be known. When the war began the hard bread manufacturers—Harvey and ourselves—laid in a very considerable quantity of low priced flour, and kept ourselves, as far as finances would allow, well stocked up, and the price for two and

a half years. I think it was kept at pre-war prices, and finally when we asked the Food Board for an increase we could only show for the previous six months a profit of 20 cents per bag. We asked, as flour had gone up several dollars per barrel, that we should be allowed a somewhat further profit, and the reply was that if we were satisfied with twenty cents per bag profit previously why now should we look for a higher rate, and they refused to allow any further increase. Imay say that it was at the request of the trade we asked this increase; it was not for myself; but at their request after a meeting with Harvey and ourselves as to the price on bread. Of course the trade did not believe us as to what we were making and how we had given them the advantage of two and a half years cheap flour; they never do, if they do not get their own way, and the consequence was that some of them started in on another bakery and developed the trade bakery and imagined they were going to make a fortune out of hard bread. Of course at present there are very small profits on bread and will be until of course someone goes under. As far as Harvey and ourselves are concerned we never had any controversy. We got together at the start of the war and determined to keep going and we never made more with the exception of a short time when I was away through ill health there was some little larger profit on bread, but immediately on my return in October last the price was reduced. I do not mind anybody seeing our returns, as they will show we did not pay any profit tax. My income came from outside my business.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I am quite satisfied that that substantiates the position I took that the late Board utilized the machinery it had to keep prices down. I may say as regards Hon. Mr. Browning and also Mr. Harvey we found they were imbued with the spirit to be satisfied with a minimum profit. And it is true also the trade on Water Street wanted a larger profit. Mind you I do not say that was profiteering, because it must be remembered that with 20 cents profit on a bag of bread costing $4.00, they would be entitled to 40c. on $8.00 bread, but we did not give it to them. The same with butterine. On at least three occasions they approached us for permission to raise the cost, and in every instance we gave them permission but not to the extent they asked, and before doing so we had the Auditor General go over their books and make a report as to conditions and what increase he thought justified. According to the report made we dealt with the situation. And it was the same with everything else. The gentleman opposite who is an importer of flour knows this.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—He also imports baking-powder.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I hope his operation in this will be as successful as his operation in flour. Now that disposes of these two matters. I say that the whole situation is a reflection upon the agitation against the late Food Control Board, of which I, in the last election, was considered the worst character, for making the people eat 'hog feed.' I saw in an advertisement, I do not want to do an injustice, but I saw the Food Control Board had an advertisement to issue permits for Government Standard Flour. This is not pre-war flour, but Government Standard is good flour.

HON. MR. MEWS:—It was simply the Food Control Board making an agreement to get pre-war, that is white flour, we were not licensing war standard flour. The general concensus of opinion is that we do not want war flour.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—There

has been no grading of flour of Canada since Armistice was signed.

HON. MR. MEWS:—They are not using pre-war flour.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—They are using equivalent to it. I am subject to correction.

HON. MR. WINTER:—Standard grade is higher than war-war-standard.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—There are 6 P.C. and 4 P.C. and 2 P.C. The worst is the 6% extraction. Is that flour being sold here now? To_day we can get into Newfoundland all pre-war flour from Canada.

HON. MR. MEWS:—A concession has been granted. We can get white pre-war flour. We are getting a better flour than that allowed to be used in Canada.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Yes, I know that. But why issue permits to bring in second grade Canadian flour? Can we charge the same price as for better flour.

HON. MR. MEWS:—The object in advertising the issuing of permits was to find out whether Government Standard or pre-war flour was required. No permits have however been issued for Government Standard Flour. In case of the outports we have written a letter requiring whether pre-war or war standard was intended in their applications. In most cases the reply has not come yet, and for this reason more details cannot at present be given.

HON. MR. STEER:—I thought these remarks of the hon. member a criticism of the Food Control Board. What has Food Control Board to do if not to regulate prices which are going up.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I did not wish to criticise Control Board. I have been bombarded for so long I wished to make my case clear. I meant nothing in the nature of striking below the belt. I recognise the difficulty of the subject to be discussed; personally it is a matter of unfastening points. With respect to two items we have the statement that nothing has been done. I did not know the price of butterine was higher. The price had not increased before we went out. I do say that the gentlemen are taking no steps with regard to other things of hard bread. The Food Control Board is not functionating except with regard to sugar.

HON. MR. WINTER:—I wish to make a few remarks in connection with butterine. Had the price continued as made by Control Board all factories would be closed up. Hon. Mr. Steer stated that one closed as a result of the restrictions put in force by Food Control Board.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—It was not alone because of restrictions.

HON. MR. WINTER:—Because of losing money. The second would have closed up if permission had not been given to increase price. They would have had to go out of business because they were manufacturing at a considerable loss. As many of you know a considerable quantity of creamery butter is used in the manufacture of butterine. The price was raised from fifty to sixty cents. Canadian cream_ery was bought for sixty-seven to seventy cents. Was it possible to manufacture butterine for forty cents a pound and put seventy cent butter in it? The mere fact of two factories having to go out of business was good evidence that there was no profiteering. The third factory paid a small dividend due to their being fortunate in making purchase of raw material. The fourth factory I am not in a position to know of. There is no profiteering in butterine. It is the worst paying industry in the country. No industry paid smaller dividends than butterine factory. This does away with the idea of profiteering. To-day we are buying butter for forty-five cents a pound in

the making of which seventy cent butter was used.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—One or two factories went out of business. I do not know to what extent we were responsible. There were other causes operating besides our operation. The factory on the West Coast (I hope I am not bringing in private affairs) I know at one time asked permission to put up the price. One difficulty was in procuring cattle and another the inability to get raw material. Our Food Control restrictions may have been the last straw. They were not responsible entirely. We were between the devil and the deep sea, trying to keep price down on the one hand and to keep price up on the other for the operatin of the industry. We tried to hold th balance evenly. This manifesto shows what thanks we got for it. However, unless occasioned to explain anything I do not purpose delaying the Committee longer.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—When this Bill was introduced I asked "What is profiteering?" What is profiteering is left to the arbitrary decision of the Committee. It appears that the manufacturer is not allowed to exact even due profit. I will quote a case. Last year I imported one thousand bags of sugar. This was all taken away from me. Two hundred bags were re-sold to me at a considerably higher price than mine, the other eight hundred bags were distributed to my opponents in business. My foresight and enterprise had put me in a position to make money out of this a legitimate business transaction but I was debarred from doing so by the Food Control Committee. There is no definite regulation to this effect. We have heard to-day that one party went out of business on account of arbitrary control on account of this control, and this is why I object to this measure. We have only their own judgment to go by. If we are going to pass a Bill of this kind we should know what is meant by "profiteering." At the end of the year we make a living profit of five or seven per cent in pre-war times. Expenses are doubled or trebled since then. If we not get a percentage of profit we cannot live. If those people who do a general business dealing in pork, beef, etc., lose on one article they could not increase profit on another. Before discussing this Bill in a reasonable way we must know what "profiteering" is. Then we can deal with it in an intelligent manner, and formulate a scale of prices by percentage or otherwise.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—The hon. gentleman has not studied the Bill sufficiently well. The Board has not arbitrary control. There is right, given under the Act, to appeal from the decision of Board to the Supreme Court. The function of the Board is to investigate complaints made with regard to unreasonable profit, and to protect the public interest. The Board determines what reasonable profit is. If party is not satisfied he may appeal to the Supreme Court. It is a question of reasonableness. Parties have to give a fair account of what is reasonable, what is fair under the circumstances. Profiteering is the making of unreasonable profit. When the facts are known in connection with importation, cost at landing, cost of getting into store, expenses in connection with sale of article, what is a legitimate profit for seller to charge to the consumer, that should not be a very difficult matter to determine or to deal with, provided all facts and circumstances are brought out before court.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I was reading an outstanding case on this side of the water during the past few weeks, arising out of the operation of the original Food Control Board of Canada. A Court of Commerce was set up to decide all these questions.

This Act is word for word the English Act.—The necessity appears to exist in England too—rate of profit not percentage of profit.—One of the first matters the Court was called upon to deal with was that of the Canadian newspapers re the manufacture of paper—the price was too high. The Court decided in favour of newspapers. If decision given against manufacturers was not satisfactory it could be refuted by Supreme Court in two weeks. No man can be injured by this. Obviously it would be unfair for the Board to act in its own case. The Board lays complaint before a magistrate. It has a right to fix certain prices under certain conditions. If the retailer is dissatisfied he goes up to the Supreme Court and gets satisfaction.

HON. MR. MEWS:—I just intend making a few remarks very briefly. I think Sir Patrick will acknowledge that while he was Chairman of the Food Control Board I was in the same boat with him, politically, and I tried to get a fair view of matters. In the first place the old Food Control Board took up operations in the general clamour for something to be done; war had come. Matters that were extraordinary came up. Flour went up considerably in price. The public got wind of it. That brought them into investigation into those industries in which flour and other substances were used and in which advances had been made. As a result they controlled the industries and were in a position to ask these industries to seek from the Food Board any increase in price. As a matter of fact, the Food Board has more to less to function along that way. I mean they cannot go down into every shop on Water Street and find out the price of every article that is sold in order to say that they are profiteering. The machinery is not there, and it is impossible for a Board to do all that it perhaps should do in that way, but that the old Board had these things under control, and, as has been evidenced this afternoon, under very drastic control in which no profiteering was done, in a way prepared the ground for the new Board, and unless anything very drastic occurred in prices it was not necessary to go to all the trouble they had. I may say that as Chairman of the Food Board I made it my business to inform myself on lots of these matters and to approach some of the men who were interested in industries and food stuffs in order to find out if there were any grounds for action. It is perhaps preferable to work in this way sometimes. As to the Board not functioning, well, I guess Hon. Mr. McGrath knows what time they spent and what meetings they had, and perhaps he can imagine that we have not been altogether sitting in our office day after day without doing something in connection with the Food Board and the duties we are supposed to do. We have meetings many times a week. The charge that we are not functioning is scarcely correct for the honourable gentleman to make, as he himself has pointed out that we had an investigation into the price of milk, as he also had in his day. From the evidence that we got we found that it seemed to be a perfectly legitimate rise in the price and we sanctioned the increase. In one week for our own information we took up the matter of dry goods and as far as possible we classified dry goods and had the importers appear before us and see what profit they put on these goods. With regard to the Profiteering Bill, I do not propose to say anything much. Sir Patrick McGrath thinks there will be no complaints at all under it. If so, I do not think we should worry very much about what the honourable friend at my left wants with respect to reasonable profit. Of course, one would naturally go into the circumstances of each case and the de-

fendant would be at liberty to bring in all the evidence he wished in regard to it. With regard to general control, there has been a great outcry against it, but I think that in many instances the Board can show that it has kept prices down. Business conditions in Newfoundland to-day are not quite what they have been in the last three or four years, and I take it it is not the duty of a Food Board either to take upon itself the duty of regulating all the business or attempt to interfere to such an extent that it would seriously injure the trade of the Colony. To my mind the matter of profiteering is something that should be taken up now in order that the public may be satisfied one way or the other whether their demands or their clamour is correct. As to bringing complaints to the Food Board with respect to profiteering, as I stated on another occasion when Sir Patrick McGrath was not present, if the Consumers' League that was formed some weeks ago comes into operation that would form a central body to which anyone could make complaints and they, being impersonal, might place the complaint before us, and in that way people would not be afraid of bringing complaints when the complaints were thought to be justified.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—As to percentage increase, if the increase is allowed on a percentage basis the people will be making much more profit than before the war. Some time ago when the cost of putting out bread went up we were not allowed any more profit per bag than we were allowed on the bread when it cost only half or not half as much. We wanted to increase our profits and the discount to the trade. We went to the Food Control Board and placed the circumstances before them, and their reply was, "No, we will not allow it." They allowed us to make twenty cents per bag only and the same amount they allowed to the trade for selling it, in spite of the fact that the cost had increased very much.

HON. MR. STEER:—But you were not asking for any more profit. You were merely asking for the same profit on the same capital invested.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—If on a given quantity of bread in a year I make a profit and on that turnover for the next year I am allowed to double that profit, surely I am making twice the profit. Supposing I put out 50,000 bags upon which I make 20c. profit per bag, and put out next year 50,000 bags upon which I make 40c. per bag, surely I am making double the profit.

HON. MR. STEER:—Yes, exclusively of trade discount.

HON. MR. BROWNING: — All charges of whatsoever sort are added to the cost of a bag of bread, whether discount or anything else, labor, raw material and everything, and over and above all the cost you are allowed a profit that is 20c. a bag. If you are allowed 40c. you are surely doubling your profit.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I think there is some misunderstanding in this matter. It is quite correct that when these gentlemen came to us saying they were entitled to more profit we said in effect, "You may be entitled to get it, but you are not going to get it." Now if in Newfoundland at that time there had been a Board of Commerce to which these gentlemen could have gone, that Board of Commerce might have reversed our decision, but there was no higher authority to which they could go, and we got away with it.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—Does the honourable gentleman press his amendment?

HON. MR. STEER:—No.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—I would ask the honourable gentleman in charge of the Bill to explain what section 11 means.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—A Board ap-

pointed under the Act will be composed of persons living in the city of St. John's. Now if a complaint be made from some extern section of the country there would not be any opportunity for the Board to investigate the complaint and they may delegate their power to a Committee in that place or the Governor in Council may appoint Committees in places where complaints have been made for the purposes of investigating them or for the purpose of doing everything which the Board may do.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—I take it that that would not apply to St. John's.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—The Bill says "Local and other Committees." This Act is a copy of the English Act and this is part of the machinery created under that Act for its carrying out. There is a Minister of Food in England and then there are Committees in every town and almost every village, County Boards and every other kind of Boards to carry out the details of the Act (Section 12) I would suggest to the honourable gentleman that this section be amended. While in the previous section it will be noted the Governor in Council may appoint these local committees, under Section 12 the Board may make regulations as to the constitution, powers and procedure of such committees and these regulations without any approval of the Governor in Council become equivalent to a section of the Act. I think the regulations that are made by these Boards ought to be approved by the Governor in Council, the regulations having effect as though enacted in this Act "On approval by the Governor in Council."

Amendment carried.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Now there is this Section about excepting cases, "and in cases where local proceedings are taken, for the purpose of such proceedings." What is the meaning of that? I would suggest that that Section be deferred until we get some information.

Committee rose, reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

On motion the House adjourned until Monday next at four o'clock.

MONDAY, June 7th, 1920.

House met pursuant to adjournment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs House went into Committee on the Bill entitled An Act to Check Profiteering. Hon. Mr. McNamara in the Chair.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Before the Bill passes I should like to refer to statement of the hon. gentleman now in charge of the Food Board a few days ago that freight rates inward were reduced. I gathered he had his information from Mr. Gosling, and I took the trouble to call up that gentleman this morning and was informed Hon. Mr. Mews must have misunderstood him. He said he understood the hon. gentleman to ask if freight rates inward had increased and he said "No," except as to outward. He then referred me to Mr. Cornick and he said no also, but freight rates outward had increased 20%.

HON. MR. MEWS:—Of course I have to take Mr. Gosling's explanation, but my recollection certainly is that he told me freights were coming down, and we were not talking of the Red Cross Line but of rates from Montreal and he certainly gave me the impression that if not down now were coming down and gave me an instance or two where rates were lessened.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill with some amendment, and it was ordered the Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

HON. MR. GIBBS moved the House into Committee on the Encouragement of Agriculture Bill, Hon. Mr. Cook in the Chair.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—In ex-

planation of this Bill I may say that it is an amendment to the two statutory laws at present in existence in relation to the expenditure of the Agricultural Vote. Previous to the war there was a vote of $20,000 for Agriculture and $20,000 for a Model Farm. This Model Farm seems never to have matured, but the money was absorbed in the General Agricultural Vote. Of course $20,000 is a ridiculous expenditure for such an important industry when you consider that the Game and Inland Fishery Board has an annual expenditure of $26,000. We are now asking for a small advance, $25,000 for the annual vote and $30,000 for a Model Farm. We are again reverting to the policy of Sir Robert Bond. Now perhaps the thought is running through the minds of hon. gentlemen that this is not an agricultural country. I admit that in part, but not in toto. I say that with what the climate and the soil can produce we can support one million of a population. I have compiled figures, and they are astonishing. I wil give you Dr. Talmies' figures for Canada last year. The total agricultural wealth was estimated at $7,379,299,000. The cause of that high figure is that everybody produces a little. While Newfoundland is not an agricultural country, I will give yau an estimate of our agricultural stock in trade. We have horses of the value of $2,401,-350; horned cattle, $2,398,620; hay, $2,431,191; potatoes, $3,131,490; turnips, $239,977, a total estimate of $10,-602,828. This does not include sheep, pigs, poultry, eggs, meat, fodder, oats and other produce, which, if added, would give a total estimate of twelve and a half millions of dollars for the year. Those figures are astounding to people who pronounce this not an agricultural country, but I think they are correct. It is our second industry, next to the fishery, yet this department is floating along with a grant of $20,-000 a year. Cumparing these figures with minerals and timber; timber of all kinds were valued at $1,006,231; paper pulp exported, $2,020,522 and minerals at exporters' valuation $627,-823. And if these figures are not correct and a little below par, still agriculture is our second industry and should be encouraged. We hope to encourage it and propose to encourage it and know it will be a long hard drive and will take years to do what should have been done long ago, that is to feed the people with what the soil will produce so that we will cease importing what we can produce ourselves. Now taking the question of vegetables, we might safely begin at the potatoe question, which is certainly a burning one with us, and I may say that there is no hopes that the products of the soil will be reduced in value for some years. We have some figures of Sir George Foster on this as follows:— During the Napoleonic war it took the world nine years to come down to normal, and there was an advance in prices then of something like 75%. During the Civil War in the United States, it took 12 years to come down to normal, and the advance was 100%, and now it will take 12 years, and prices have advanced from 120% to 300%. Consequently with these facts in our mind and the products of the soil increasing possibly, it is up to the people of Newfoundland to produce as much as they can during the next few years. The question of potatoes is most urgent at present. The production las year was ——— barrels, whereas imports were 35,084,2/3 barrels, so that another little push along would give us enough potatoes and importation would cease. We have tried in every way to encourage production. We investigated and found thirteen of our electoral districts infected with canker and we have approached the British Board and they have advised a

canker-proof potato and we have imported 800 barrels of those and hope they will prove canker-proof in Newfoundland. They may prove a failure, but we can only give them a trial. Coming now to the subject of Model Farm we are following the footsteps of Sir Robert Bond, who I consider the best farmer in Newfoundland. We are asking for this small grant from the Government to start a Model Farm and stock-raising here in St. John's. There has been a good deal of stock at one time or another brought into the country. I am sorry to say that during the past ten years they have been a total failure. Cattle imported into the country should be hall-marked. We should not take any in future unless they are guaranteed.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Thirty thousand dollars seems a small amount of money to spend in the purchase of stock and the erection of buildings?

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—We are going to begin to crawl before we walk. It is our intention to erect but one building this year.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I congratulate the honourable member on the Annual Report of Agriculture which I enquired about a few days ago—(I read it with great interest)—and also on the industry and energy exhibited in the work of his department. I do not think that the amount of money stated however will be sufficient to accomplish what he has in view. Before the war forty thousand dollars was granted for agricultural purposes—twenty thousand for a Model Farm. This was used for agriculture generally. The Model Farm was allowed to drop and was ultimately eliminated altogether. Forty thousand then was as much as eighty thousand now. That amount won't represent as much in actual cash nor won't do as much as amount provided before the war. As far as expenditure of thirty thousand on a Model Farm is concerned, after he gets some buildings, registered stock, etc., I don't see that he will have much wherewith "To make white the South Side Hills with sheep." The present Government criticised the late administration—(I'll refrain from reading another extract from the Premier's Manifesto)—just as strongly in this connection and made a declaration just as detrimental to it as it did to the Food Control Board. The country will be disappointed—fifty-five thousand, which in round figures is twenty-seven thousand before the war, won't accomplish all he has in view, and I am afraid his expectations won't be realized.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—My hon. friend said at one time that model farms were no good. It is the boast of Canada that it has thirty-four; however, Sir Michael Cashin, another friend of mine, said we did not want any more fakes. Mr. Bennett, who knew all about agriculture, having got his earliest inspiration from Lord Morris—(he belongs to that school of agriculture called the 'Two Blade of Grass School')—made similar statements. Sir John Crosbie wanted us to vote a huge sum. We have taken over farm operated by the Lunatic Asylum, also the stock, and do not intend purchasing any buildings this year. We have also an excellent piece of land adjoining Mr. Steer's property. It was asked for about ten years ago for the purchase of building sanitoria for consumptives. I remember and some of the gentlemen present, no doubt, also remember—this was in the days when as a result of the return of the late Government Reids were going to give eighteen sanitoria to the Colony. We all went out there on the occasion of the laying of the corner stone. The Duke of Connaught laid the stone. It is there still. Next year I hope to grow a crop on this

ground or have cattle on it belonging to the Model Farm. They call our Model Farm a fake! If they want to talk fakeing this $3500 piece of land will furnish them with material. It is a scandalous piece of fakeing. We hope now it will become a benefit to the country. We are going slowly and at the same time carefully. We propose putting a small demonstration farm on it, similar to the one at Great Slane Lake, Canada. I do not propose allowing those people to blackguard it, so I make this explanation.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I am not agriculturalist. I spoke on general principles. I am sorry that my remarks lead to such strong language from the hon .member. With reference to Sir Michael Cashin and Sir John Crosbie, they may not be agriculturists but they have probably done as much as the honourable member in this respect. I would be sorry to suggest that he knows all there is to know of agriculture. That they do know something is a question the House will probably be able to pronounce upon.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—I cannot agree with you on this point. They should not condemn policy of Model Farm when they know nothing about it.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I was never able to satisfy myself that beneficial results accrued from Sir Robert Bond's policy. The hon. gentleman opposite may be more successful. Now with reference to the sanatoria. They were offered in good faith. I do not think they were a fake. There were a variety of circumstances which prevented the plans being put into execution. The Duke of Connaught laid the corner stone only one month before war began. And however desirous the Reid's may have been to carry out the policy they may have been unable to go on with their programme. I think enquiries will show the Canadian authorities for the Model Farm were appointed through political influence.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—One is a veterinery surgeon!

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—He was a politician in the Federal Parliament at Ottawa. With regard to the thirty-four Model Farms. I have been amongst them. I spent a week with Professor Robertson negotiating for a visit to Newfoundland. It is generally admitted that model farms have proved a success in Canada, it being an agricultural country. Whether the hon. gentleman thinks the same thing will apply to a small fishing country like Newfoundland is another matter.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—It is our second industry.

HON. SIR P. T .McGRATH:—Except in a few districts in the neighbourhood of St. John's. Nobody in this country raises a ton of hay.

HON. MR. MEWS:—Oh, yes, there are many people who do.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Yes, in districts near St. John's—Torbay and other suburbs but in Bonavista Bay, Placentia and there abouts there are not. If gentlemen like Sir John Crosbie and Sir Michael Cashin express opinions, these are at least entitled to respect. The hon. gentleman does not know everything about this subject that there is to know. Both these men have had some experience and probably know as much about the subject as the hon. gentleman himself. However, if plan outlined is to be carried into effect on fifty-five thousand dollars and results attained he will have his hands full.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—My hon. friend made reference to Dr. J. W. Robertson. Here is what he says a month ago re Model Farms:

Toronto Globe, May 17th.

MODEL FARMS.

"On the productive side of her agriculture Canada is, as yet very imper-

fectly and incompletely organized. Locally it seemed to him there should be a Neighbourhood Improvement Association, grouped around an illustration farm, in every community of farmers in Canada. That would be one means whereby the people would organize themselves so that the ability of the Natural leaders of the locality would be brought into full use and play for the benefit of the neighbours, the development of the leaders themselves, and the improvement of the community."

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—The people of this country are not farmers.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—I congratulate the present Government on plan outlined to develop the agricultural industry of the Colony. I hope it will be the means of bringing down the price of potatoes. It was stated that 800 barrels of good seed potatoes had been procured presumably from Scotland, where some of the finest seed potatoes are to be obtained. With regard to the coal question. This country is being fleeced with the price of coal. I hope an effort will be made to reduce it. Matters can hardly be improved while we have such coal-carriers as the Neptune and Eagle, ships which can carry only 550 or 650 tons. It would be within the bounds of possibility, however, if we had steamers such as the Bonaventure and Bellaventure which could carry from 1300 to 1900 tons. It is true we have very few deep water piers but Shea & Co. and Furness Withy can accommodate large steamers and United Coal Company pier has 18 feet of water. Now Mr. Chairman, if some arrangements are made whereby we can get coal at lowest price from Belgium, France or Canada we are entitled to it. It has been sold cheaper behind the scenes and the sooner the Government gets behind the scenes the better. Coal could be sold much cheaper. The various expenses are not as large as sometimes thought. Two thousand tons of coal can be imported into this country and sold for $13 per ton. The person who gave me these figures imports more coal in one month than both my learned friends who disagree with him, do in one year. Now that means that for 2000 tons of coal we have to pay landed $23,085. If we add to that a profit of 10% the coal can still be sold at $25,000. Give a further $1000 or even $1500 for incidental increases and you will be able to sell the coal at $13 per ton.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Why not go into the business?

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—I am just telling what could be done. Suppose you can even sell it for $16.00 you will be doing something. But my hon. friend says 600,000 tons of ore were exported during the year; and it is on that I base my calculations. The situation is really better than that. That amount is only a make-believe. It is only the passing of an export entry on which 7½ cents per ton is paid as an export entry on ore. If you are sending Bell Island ore to North Sydney see that they send us in return decent coal. Here you have a company reckoned as being worth over $500,000,000; which can go to the monied interests of London and on that raise money. Probably the actual value are getting our ore, and are making absolutely no returns. It is time I urge, that the people of this country woke up to this fact. They are now being swindled with coal at $20.80 which is not fit to be called coal. Now, Mr. President, I congratulate the Hon. Minister of Agriculture and Mines on the ability he has displayed in the handling of his department; and here is one subject in relation thereto which I trust he will take up. He is big enough I am sure to grapple with it, and he knows as well as I do that this amount of $627,000 is

a make-believe; arrived at for the benefit of export entries. I do hope that when he comes here next year and asks for $100,000 for agriculture, he will have had an opportunity to go into this matter. We will support his agriculture policy; and trust that his efforts in the direction I have mentioned will be quite as successful

HON. MR. BISHOP:—Mr. Chairman, I feel quite sure the figures of the Minister of Agriculture and Mines are very interesting; and I am sure we all hope that the policy outlined by him will be very successful. It is a great pity that for many years past as I understood him to say, we have had to import so much farm produce; and if we have in Newfoundland sufficient ground on which to grow sufficient vegetables for our own consumption; I am sure that the efforts of his department to have this done will meet with the support of all. I am quite aware that the question of coal and the price of coal is a sore point at the present time, but I submit that if any hon. member of this House goes into this matter in detail and supplies figures; these figure sought at least to be approximately correct. I ordered half a ton of coal to-day, (all that I am permitted to order at one time), and that half ton was delivered at my residence at less than the price at which I imported coal yesterday. That coal which was imported by me yesterday and is now on my wharf, cost more than did this coal landed at my premises today. It is all very well t otalk about compelling the coal companies to give us coal and to say that shipping should bring coal at such and such a price; but you cannot induce anybody to bring in coal for $4.00 per ton; nor can you make the companies give us coal. But the fact remains that coal is being sold here cheaper than the price at which it can be imported.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—It may be that my hon. friend cannot import coal to-day at $7 or $8 per ton; but if we had reciprocity with the companies at Bell Island, there is no reason why that could not be done. They have the coal and we have the ore. We should get the benefit of our ore. With regard to my figures, Mr. Chairman, I may say that these have been examined by those in the trade—I am not and never was in the trade—and I have been told that they are very reasonable.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—Somebody has been pulling your leg.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—Well then they have a long leg to pull; and they won't have much success. If the facts are wrong then somebody else is wrong.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—The facts are right but the figures are wrong.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—Perhaps they may be slightly wrong; but the facts do remain. There is no commodity we more need to-day than coal and I am here to see that the best interests of the people are protected. Ore is shipped out at the tax of seven and one-half cents a ton. That tax is hopelessly insufficient. The tax from this ore ought to be sufficient to pay some of the other expenses of the Government. Yes, Mr. Chairman, the figures may be wrong, figuratively speaking they may be wrong; but the basis on which they are prepared is correct. They have been given to me by those in the business; and while it does not make any difference to me whether coal is obtained for $7 or not; the people of this country are entitled to a first class business arrangement with these companies in which their rights are safeguarded. As far as the figures are concerned they are accurate; and allowing a maximum o f$2.00 per ton difference in these you will still have coal selling at $15.00.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—Mr. Chair-

man, in the course of the debate if any hon. gentleman has facts to disclose, I think it would be better to state them than to commence quoting figures. It is all very well for the hon. gentleman to occupy and waste the time of this House by the speech that he has just delivered; that if you do such and such, the result would be so and so; but by doing so no help is being given the subject before the chair. What coal has to do with agricultural problems submitted to this House by the Minister of Agriculture and Mines I do not know. But the Hon. Mr. Anderson is entirely wrong; and he should take the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Bishop; serious remarks, to heart. When he talks about requiring a company doing business here to do this and that he is wasting time. Surely there is competition enough in our business here to give the man who is satisfied with a small margin of profit an opportunity to do his own importing, and get us coal. Now at the present time we can get no coal from Nova Scotia. We will not be able to get any for one month. Sixty or eighty vessels are there or to arrive; and these will require all the coal available for that period. But as I have said we are not now discussing this question. We are debating the question as to what is the best way of conducting an agricultural farm. We must keep to the subject before us diligently and not prolong the debate unduly by going outside the subject.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—Mr. Chairman, I am deeply indebted to the hon. member for what he has said. The facts however still have to be faced that 627,000 dollars worth of ore were shipped last year and for that ore we should receive reciprocity. This year the outcome will probably be greater, and the greater it is the more do we deserve better treatment. The Bell Island company plans to develop their work a great deal this year. It is said their intention is to expend something like from three to five million dollars on the industry. Now if they find our ores sufficiently profitable to justify such an enormous expenditure, it is up to them to give us a square deal.

The facts and figures I have quoted are correct, absolutely correct and have been prepared by people in the coal business. They may be prefaced by "ifs" but all the modern developments were prefaced by ifs, and if they had not been faced on that assumption, they could never have been realized. I am sure this is a matter which will receive the very best attention of the Minister who has been so active since his assumption of office; and that just as it is his intention now to improve our agricultural conditions, he will during his administration improve the condition of all the people of this country so far as coal is concerned.

HON. MR. McNAMARA:—Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in support of this Bill as introduced by the Hon. Dr. Campbell; but I agree with Sir Patrick McGrath that the amount voted is very small, and not sufficient to guarantee very large results. Reference has been made to the $26,000 given to the Game Board; but I would say that if this money voted to agriculture is as successfully spent as is the money left with the Game Board, it will be well spent, for with that money the Game Board polices the rivers of the country while the members of that Board give expert advice free to the country without any monetary compensation whatsoever. One question however I would like to ask the Hon. Dr. Campbell and it is re his valuation of horses at $2,000,000.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—This was arrived at from the 1911 census and the increases reported by the Societies. There was a Seymour report in 1911 and another in 1901. These figures have been brought nearly up to date

by returns from our Societies. We have not the same advantages here as they have in Canada. There they have a census every year. We only have one in ten.

HON. MR. McNAMARA:—I was not referring to this matter, but more especially to the importations from Charlottetown and Toronto, from which as is well known we import largely. However, if this agricultural policy will be successful in increasing the output of vegetables in this country, it will be worthy of our fullest support. Our firm is to-day probably the largest importer of vegetables and at the present time we are almost ashamed to ask the price we have to pay. Anything which will remedy this would be welcomed. At the same time I hardly think the model farm is the best way out of the difficulty. The worst of that is that it is a benefit only to the immediate neighbourhood. In the remote districts they are not going to get any benefit; and I do not think as a whole it will be of the service stated. In this way I would also like to say that a policy of land clearing would be better than the idea of a model farm.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—The question of land clearing and bounties is one which needs to be carefully considered. It is my opinion that a bonus should not be given per area of land cleared. It should be given I think on the amount of hay grown the first year; or in some other way. The practice has been I think to clear the land just for the sake of the bonus; and then to let it sod over. That as will be understood is worthless.

HON. MR. TEMPLEMAN:—The one thing I can't get at Mr. Chairman is where the outports come in under this Bill. You cannot get young men to-day interested in farming, and if it is your intention to train young men, where are you going to get them? I have never been able to find any.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—I have been in pretty colse contact with all the farms in St. John's East and West; and though their politics have been poor I find their industry and ability as farmers are quite up to the ordinary; and that they would be a good field from which to obtain results. They would be made quite interested I believe in the working of a model farm; and this farm, established as an experiment, would be duplicated wherever needed, should it meet with the success that we all expect. We will then secure the best parent stock for the country and with the male products of that farm will gradually grade up our animals. Our animal husbandry is at great fault, and the A B C of it is stock registration, and this is the first Government to make any pretence at that. The first thing I did was to get up a stock book of animals, as they have everywhere else. We have now registered in that registry many thorobred animals. We will prevent the running at large of scrub bulls or any other animals but the pure thorobred animal in localities. We have a propaganda on to have people grade up their animals and cannot do this by introducing scrub stock. Every animal owned by the department will be registered and must have the hall-mark for the department.

HON. MR. TEMPLEMAN:—Might I ask the Minister when this good stock is going to be placed around the country?

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—We have not got our vote through yet, and they have to be selected and brought here. Bonavista has already applied for two and they will be good ones too. I may explain another thing too. I have a record in my department where an executive member of the late Government made a demand last year for a man to be allowed $60 for allowing two scrub animals to run at large, when he should have got 60 days.

HON. MR. TEMPLEMAN:—What my hon. friend is talking about is all right, but I want to know when we are going to get them. Coming back to farming. I have been through the East and West of St. John's a good bit and I should like you to point me out a piece of green land turned up within the past 12 months. I do not see any, or in Trinity or Bonavista. They are turning over the same land all the time, in many cases what was then grandfather's land. That is the kind of farming done in the outports. I may say the young boys are not allowed to do the work now.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—We hope next year to have down experts in agriculture and animal husbandry. We are going slowly and will then be in a position to take in young men from this country and get the advantage of expert knowledge.

HON. MR. TEMPLEMAN:—Why should we in the outports pay for a Model Farm in St. John's?

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—Well we will give you one in Bonavista if this is a success.

The Committee reported the Bill without amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—In moving the second reading of the Act to amend the Business Profits Tax Act, 1917, I desire to point out that it provides firstly for an explanation of the Act for 1920; secondly the option formerly given banks or banking corporations to pay taxe either on business or upon profits is now given the Minister of Finance; thirdly for an extension of the time for returns until May instead of February; fourthly instead of a penalty of ten per cent. for not making returns, it will now be ten per cent., plus one per cent. for each month until paid. These amendments are not of a radical change and do not make any material change in the Bill.

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

HON. MR. GIBBS:—In moving the second reading of the Tenancies and Grants Amendment Bill, I may say it is merely to extend the provisions of that Act for another year.

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

HON. PRESIDENT read a message from th eAssembly announcing the passage of Bills respecting Licenses to Cut Hardwood and Concerning Foreign Enemy Aliens; also that they had passed the Council's amendments to Bills concerning the Registration of Midwives, Act relating to Death Duties and an Act relating to Legislative Disabilities and the Vacation of Seats in the House of Assembly.

The foregoing Bills were then read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

House then adjourned until to-morrow at four o'clock.

TUESDAY, June 8th, 1920.

House met at 4 p.m.

On motion of HON. MR. GIBBS the Bill entitled "An Act to Check Profiteering" was read a third time and a message war ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly saying this House had passed same with an amendment.

HON. MR. SHEA moved the third reading of Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Section 9 of Chapter 139 of the Consolidated Statutes of the (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Encouragement of Agriculture.'"

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—Before the passing of this Bill I wish to make a few observations. I am not desirous of occupying the time and attention of this House without its being a benefit. The figures I stated in this House yesterday are absolutely correct. Mr. Bishop did not agree with me on one point regarding cost of shedding. I find upon enquiry that the stevedor is

paid one dollar, and 40c. is the cost of shedding. So that my figure which was $1.40 is exact. Now, Mr. President, the coal situation is alarming. Whether an effort is to be made to get coal from North Sydney or elsewhere I do not know, screened coal is at present $17.75, domestic coal of lower grade is quoted at $17.25. Last year (and I presume its being done now) a certain number of gentlemen started the Mary to go to Bell Island for a cargo of coal and landed it in St. John's at $12. This was retailed in St. John's at $15. If it is not convenient to land coal from large ship in St. John's why not bring it to Bell Island? If any preference is to be given at all we are entitled to their coal. In an address delivered by a member of Parliament in London a short time ago it was stated that the company in control of that vast industry at Bell Island was capitalized at five hundred million dollars. No wonder such a vast company can be floated. This country is the largest contribution to the assets of that company. Surely between all the steam ship companies—the Dominion Coal Company with others—surely at least they can provide ten cargoes of coal for St. John's. If it cannot be landed at St. John's then let it be landed at Bell Island. When a cargo does arrive half the time it is retailed out in quarter tons. Why can't whole town store coal as it comes in. It would mean only the same expense. Something ought to be done to relieve this situation. But the situation to-day is this, that something must be done. I think the situation as we find it to-day is worthy of serious thought, no matter from where it emanates and no matter whether we waste twenty minutes in this House or half an hour. I stated here yesterday that some twenty-eight steamers were waiting at Sydney and the honourable gentleman said he understood some time ago there were sixty waiting their turn to be loaded with coal. This is addiog the cost of the wages of the men and all the expenses of the schooner to the cost of the coal. We will never bring down the price of coal in this way, but I think that something should be done to bring down the price, and whatever we can do in this way I am ready to support.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—I am not going to contradict the remarks of my honourable friend opposite, nor do I wish to waste the time of the House on this matter. It is quite true that I said yesterday in retort that somebody was pulling his leg. I am convinced now that, finding that so simple an operation, his informant has since pulled both of his legs. He asserts and reasserts that the figures that he quoted are absolutely correct. I simply place my statement against his that they are absolutely wrong, and I am ready to meet his informant at any time suitable to him and show him who is right and who is wrong. In one item yesterday I was wrong. When my honourable friend quoted forty cents for trimming coal I said $1.40 was nearer the truth. The exact figure is $1.20, not $1.40. To that extent I correct my remarks of yesterday. It is not my desire to trespass upon the time of the House, but I will be glad to meet my honourable friend and his informant at any time that suits them.

On motion the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act respecting Certificates of Masters and Mates." Hon. Mr. Templeman in the Chair.

HON. MR. SHEA:—Mr. Chairman, when this Bill was before the House on second reading I endeavoured to explain generally what the principles of the Bill were, and I would like to say that at present according to Chapter 169 of the Consolidated Statutes it is an offence for uncertificated masters and mates to be in charge of any ves-

sel over one hundred tons for trans-Atlantic voyages, or for anyone to employ them, and the Customs are forbidden to give them clearance. This is the law as it stands at present. I am informed that there are about one hundred and seven vessels of this class at present sailing out of St. John's and the outports, and out of that one hundred and seven vessels with one hundred and seven masters are are not more than ten or fifteen masters with certificates of any kind whatever. Now that is the position of masters as they stand to-day. In other words, if the law were put into effect to-day these vessels would be prevented from sailing and practically the whole carrying trade of the Colony would be jeopardized. It is in order to get over this temporary difficulty and meet the exigencies of the present case that this Bill has been formulated. It is a Bill which will be in operation for twlve months only, but it is to meet the requirements and bring these captains and vessels within the limits of the law as the law stands. The Commission so appointed, as you will see, consists of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Harbour Master for St. John's, and Sir John Crosbie, who is an authority on shipping, and apart from his own mercantile standing in the community has a knowledge of shipping, being late Minister of the Shipping Department. As the Hon. Mr. Bishop said, it is somewhat unusual to have a commission of this kind named in the Bill, but it was thought desirable to do so to give the public the opportunity of knowing the class of men who are at the head of the Commission. Now the selection of suitable masters from these men will be in the hands of this Commission, and it is assumed that no men who are unfit to go as masters will be granted certificates, but I look upon the whole measure as a temporary one and one to meet the present exigencies. Something has to be done. The law at present is disregarded and serious consequences might ensue if the law were put into effect. The men that are in the ships are on the whole a good class of men, and I understand the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who had charge of this Bill in the Lower House, said it was with the suggestion of the Board of Trade that this course was taken, a kind of temporary measure to meet the present needs.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—I spoke a few words respecting this Bill at the second reading. It appeared to me to be unusual legislation to name an individual in an Act of Parliament, and I thought that was not only unusual, but in the present instance undesirable, for the reason that while I have no objection whatever to any of the persons named in the Bill and I do not think any more capable men could be secured, I would say that in view of Sir John Crosbie's having left St. John's for an indefinite period and there is only six months to elapse before the Bill becomes inoperative and in view of the fact that half of the men that are uncertificated cannot possibly be in St. John's and obtain certificates within that time, the naming of such a Commission is undesirable. I have a master in a vessel now at my wharf. He will be at sea very soon, and it is extremely unlikely that he will be in St. John's again before next January. If a Commission were sitting he would get a certificate, but he may not arrive in St. John's before January, and after that date he cannot receive a certificate. He will not be able to avail of the provisions of the Act because he will not be in St. John's. Now I submit if there is any benefit in the Act at all it should extend to at least twelve months and that it should commence its sittings immediately. I think that while the measure is a good one and a necessary one, it has been nullified as it stands by con-

fining the Commission to the three persons mentioned in the Bill, because two cannot act and if you put the Bill into effect as it is nothing can possibly be done.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I think this a Bill which should be dealt with by a Select Committee who could discuss it with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who knows what he wants and why he wants it. I would like to say with respect to Section 2 there is no provision that these rules should be approved of by anybody. I do not think that any Board should have power to make rules not to be approved . Then I submit that it is possible for the Board to be sitting all New Year's Day passing people who did not get here in time to get passed on before, and I think that should be remedied. It seems to me that the same thing may happen as happened in connection with the Liquór Act. Prohibition was to come into effect on the 1st of January, but it was possible for the liquor shops to sell on New Year's Day. I think this is a Bill which should be sent to a Select Committee, particularly in view of the fact that Sir John Crosbie is out of the country and will not be back for several weeks. Likewise if the Minister of Marine and Fisheries were away, the position would be just as ii ts with Sir John Crosbie. The Board cannot do business unless the three men are present. t may be desirable to put in a clause "or any two of them," but I do not think the Bill can be remedied in that way.

HON. MR. SHEA:—I have no objection to referring it to a Select Committee, and I would therefore move that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

The Committee thereupon rose, reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

On motion the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act respecting the Issue of Certain Debenture Bonds of the Colony." Hon. Mr. Power in the Chair.

HON. MR. SHEA:—Mr. Chairman, this Bill is simply to legalize a number of Debenture Bonds that were signed by Sir Michael Cashin and Mr. Bennett after they had ceased to occupy the offices of Minister of Finance and Colonial Secretary. To remove any doubts as to the validity of these bonds it was considered necessary to bring in this Bill.

The Committee rose, and reported having passed the Bill without amendment. It was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

On motion the Bill "An Act to Regulate the Exportation of Salt Codfish" was deferred.

On motion the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act to Amend 'The Business Profits Tax Act, 1917.'" Hon. Mr. Mews in the Chair.

HON. MR. McGRATH:—Mr. Chairman, before this Bill goes through I would like to know of the report on Income Taxation by the Commission representing Great Britain and the Colonies. I understand Newfoundland was represented on that Commission. Could the honourable gentleman in charge of the Bill let me have a statement of the position of Newfoundland with respect to that. I think there should be an official report in the Colonial Secretary's office.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—I do not know of any report, but I will make inquiries.

Committee rose, reported progress, and asked leave to sit again.

Committee on the Business Profits Tax Amendment Bill rose and reported having passed the same without amendment, and it was ordered the said Bill be read a third time on to-morrow.

House went into Committee on Existing Tenancies and Ejectment of

Tenants Amendment Bill, Hon. Mr. Milley in the Chair.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—Before the Bill passes I should like to make a few remarks. I do not think this Bill has been a great success so far as its carrying out, because hundreds of people have come to me complaining of being continually harrassed in reference to their rents being increased, and rather than object they have paid them. I am sorry the Bill did not get more publicity. I know that a similar Bill in the Old Country was handled without mercy. There is no question that has created more unrest than the housing of the people, the high cost of living and the price of coal. I wish that hon. gentlemen who occupy seats in this House could have had occasion to listen as I have during the last twelve months to the most awful tales of conditions in St. John's, but it is well known to all of us that it must be very bad because many of those old rookeries have been tumbling down since I came to the country half a century ago. Many a Saturday night I have gone into houses with one or two others and helped to nail canvas over the ceilings to keep the water and wind out. An effort will be made at an early date to improve those conditions, but unfortunately there are people here who imagine houses can grow like potatoes. The vilest references have been made, but many things must be done before all will be right. But I hope the passing of this Bill will be the means of improving matters and I hope the papers will give publicity to it that it is illegal to raise rents. And I hope also that now effort has been made to improve the condition of the people and I hope that before long many of them will live in better and more comfortable homes. But we must not feel content and satisfied not to make the effort to reduce and assist the people to more comfort, better homes, less cost of living and of coal.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

HON. MR. SHEA moved the second reading of the Montreal Trust Company Authorization Bill and said: This Bill is a duplicate of that given the Eastern and Royal Trust Companies when they came here to do business, and is to enable the Montreal Trust Co. to come here and do business of the same kind.

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

HON. MR. SHEA moved the second reading of the Post and Telegraph Service Amendment Bill and said: This Bill is to give the Minister limiting his liability for loss or injury in the transmission of telegrams, and increasing the registration fees from three to five cents, and also for making a charge of five cents on parcel post. That is the principle of the Bill.

Said Bill was read a second time and ordered to be committed on to-morrow.

HON. PRESIDENT read message from the Assembly re having passed the Council's amendment in and upon the bill entitled An Act to Amend the Income Tax, 1918," without amendment.

House then adjourned until Thursday next at four o'clock p.m.

THURSDAY, June 10th, 1920.

House met at 4.00 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

On motion of the HON. MR. SHEA the following Bills were 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 same without amendment: An Act Respecting the Issue of Certain Debenture Bonds of the Colony; An Act to Amend "The Business Profits Tax Act, 1917"; An Act to Amend

Chapter 10 of 9-10 Geo. V entitled 'An Act with Respect to Existing Tenancies and the Ejectment of Tenants Therefrom."

HON. MR. SHEA laid upon the table of the House report of Select Committee on the Bill "An Act Respecting Certificates of Masters and Mates."

On motion of HON. MR. SHEA the Bill "An Act to Regulate the Exportation of Salt Codfish" was deferred until to-morrow.

House went into Committee of the Whole on Bill "An Act to Authorize the Montreal Trust Company to do Business in the Colony of Newfoundland." Hon. Mr. Anderson in the Chair.

HON. MR. SHEA:—This is a Bill similar to the Act of the Eastern Trust Company and the Royal Trust Company. It is to enable the Montreal Trust Company to do business in Newfoundland along the same lines.

Committee on Montreal Trust Co. Bill rose and reported the same without amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

House went into Committee on the Postal and Telegraph Service Bill, Hon. Mr. Murphy in the Chair.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—Will the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill kindly explain what is the limit of the liability of this clause.

HON. MR. SHEA:—I believe there is a limited liability at present. I think about £10 or $20. I can get the information if required.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—It is a very important matter, I submit. It does not seem reasonable to me that the department should be excused for neglect.

HON. MR. MEWS:—The liability is printed in the forms at present and I think this section is to make it legal or more binding. I think the Anglo Co. bind themselves to $50, and I think the Postal is the same.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—That may be all right, but I think we should know about the legislation we are passing.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I agree that the Act at present does not contain any clause empowering the P.M.G. to limit the liability of his department, and altho' such a limitation is expressed on the back of the telegraph forms it is possible for anybody to come in and sue the Government for any losses incurred through the miscarriage of the messages, and the Government is not entitled to plead on the strength of the telegraph forms, because it is not legal. Therefore the Government at present is liable for the full loss anyone may sustain for miscarriage of any message. This is put in in order that there may be some clause in an Act so that the Government could go into Court and show authority for putting this clause on the back of the telegraph forms.

HON. MR. SHEA:—As I am advised, there is a clause at present on the telegraph forms to the effect that the Government is not liable for loss on non-delivery of messages, and the question has been raised as to whether this clause has any legal power behind it and it is in order to give the Minister that legal power that this is now introduced. It is not a question of liability but to give the Minister power to put it in.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—I think the other companies have a clause on their charter which protects them but the highest amount they pay is to say "We are very sorry."

The Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

House took recess until arrival of H. E. the Governor, who having arrived and summoned the members of Hon. House of Assembly was pleased to assent to several Bills.

The House re-assembled and went into Committee on Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Certificates of Masters and Mates." Hon. Mr. Winter took the Chair.

HON. MR. SHEA:—Before asking the House to consider this matter again, I wish to draw attention to the change made in the original Bill. In clause 1 "There shall be a Board of Examiners consisting of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Harbour Master of the port of St. John's, and Sir John Crosbie, K.B.E., who shall have power to conduct examinations of applicants for certificates of service as masters and mates of sea-going ships." Any two, according to the change, may constitute the Board. The difficulty before was Sir John Crosbie's absence from the country.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—Has not this report to lie on the table twenty-four hours unless permission be given formally by the House to act otherwise?

HON. MR. SHEA:—The hon. member is correct.

Committee rose and presented report, asking leave to sit again.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—A Committee once having risen and reported and asked leave to sit again, cannot go back into Committee to-day.

HON. MR. SHEA:—In moving the second reading of Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Preservation of Beavers," I would just like to state that the Bill is one to authorize the trapping of beavers, under certain conditions. Secondly that all license must come from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Further the contents stipulate that the money derived from the sale and export of beavers "shall be paid by the Department to the Treasury and appropriated by it to a fund to be named the "State Insurance Fund."

This Bill was read a second time and was ordered to be read a third time to-morrow.

HON. MR. SHEA:—In moving the second reading of Bill entitled "An Act Concerning Former Enemy Aliens," I may say that this Bill is to prevent an enemy alien from landing,—three years after the passing of this Act,—in this Colony, or if he should land without permission it is to prevent him from remaining without the permission of the Colonial Secretary, and such permission is to be limited to three months, unless upon special grounds this permission be renewed. It prohibits him from holding property, or share in any company, or from becoming an officer or member of a crew of a British ship registered in this Colony. I beg to move the second reading of this Bill.

Bill referred to Committee of Whole House to-morrow.

Committee on Bill entitled "An Act to Regulate the Exportation of Salt Codfish" and second reading of Bill entitled "An Act respecting Licenses to cut Hardwoods" were deferred.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT:--A message has been received from the House of Assembly to the effect that they have passed the following Acts and request the concurrence of the Legislative Council: "An Act to Amend Chapter 162 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Prosecution of the Seal Fishery,'" and "An Act to amend the St. John's Pilotage Act, 1917."

On motion of HON. MR. SHEA the following Bills were read for first time: "An Act to Amend Chapter 162 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Prosecution of the Seal Fishery," and "An Act to Amend the St. John's Pilotage Act, 1917."

House adjourned till 4 p.m. to-morrow.

FRIDAY, June 11th, 1920.

House met pursuant to adjournment.

On motion of HON. MR. SHEA the Montreal Trust Co. Authorization Bill and the Postal and Telegraph Services Bill were read a third time and passed, and ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same without amendment.

House went into Committee on the Masters and Mates Certificates Bill, Hon. Mr. Steer in the Chair.

Committee rose and reported the Bill without amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

House went into Committee on the Exportation of Salt Codfish Bill, Hon. Mr. Milley in the Chair.

HON. MR. SHEA:—The subject of this Bill was fully discussed some short time ago in the Lower House, where I understand it passed without division, and for some considerable time past it has occupied a prominent place in our newspaper press, and hon. members present will be fully conversant with all its details. I may say that these regulations are part and parcel of the policy of the present Government in connection with our fisheries. They are necessarily of an experimental character, and it is hoped if they are efficiently carried out they will result in substantial benefit to the trade of the Colony. It is hoped they will have the support of the trade generally who should be willing to give them a fair trial. The Board will be composed of exporters and therefore it will be presumed that all will be done to make them successful for the community's interests.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—It appears to me that the whole Bill is so detriemntal to the mercantile interests of the Colony, and the best way to deal with it, I think, after reviewing the various clause is to move that it be read a second time this day six months. On the face of it there appears to me to be some idea of fair play, but seeing that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is practically the Government in this matter, has the appointment of four members, and that only two of this Board will be appointed by the exporters in St. John's it appears that the dictum of the Minister will pass, and any suggestions we may urge on him to deter him from the course he has mapped out, will be futile. Any restrictions on trade are objectionable. During the five years of war through which we have passed there was probably a good excuse for restrictions being put on. Now that we return to a normal state it is difficult to calculate the tamper of business and damage that would be done by the enforcing of these regulations. The institution of high rates enables competitors to step in and undersell us, and also encourages our competitors in Iceland, France and Norway to invade markets which before the proclamation we considered our prerogative to trade with. These markets have been invaded and we shall have hard work to get them back. These regulations were made probably with the best intentions, thinking they would be a good thing for the country, but the result has proved quite the contrary. I want to speak fairly in this connection. It is not altogether the result of these restrictions, but they have added immeasurably to the condition we find ourselves in to-day. In some cases last year's voyage has not yet been disposed of—owners were unable to sell at a satisfactory price—others were compelled to take a very low price. If then, with the knowledge we have now, we put on the Statute Book, legislation of a similar nature we are handicapping the industry of the country. Not merely the exporters but every man who does business in connection with the cod-fishery is effected. Ours is essentially a fishing country

and the whole body is influenced and in my humble opinion injured by an Act of this kind. We have no guarantee that there won't be flagrant instances of breaches of this Act, as there were of the other regulations, by people who ought to know better. I single out the Minister of Marine and Fisheries—people have undersold the price established by law—his committee deliberately winked at the breaches and took no action whatsoever to bring the guilty parties to task. Two or three days ago I received a letter from my agent in Brazil a portion of which will be interesting as sustaining my contention. (In paragraph read it was stated that a cargo of fish had been sold in Brazil at 98 shillings.) Now about the time that cargo had been sold at 98 shillings I had a cargo I wanted to export to the Brazilian market; I wanted the privilege of being allowed to speculate. On arrival of my ship, I wrote to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and he was agreeable that I should have that privilege but on submitting it to his Board they sat down upon my application, and refused to grant it. Here we have an Advisory Board cognizant of breaches and taking no action to check same or give explanation, and I am by the same Board penalized and not permitted to export my fish and make a satisfactory profit.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—What was regulation price then?

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—102 shillings. Now if that be done now by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and his Advisory Board what security have I got, and every honourable gentleman in the same line of business, that they will not be handicapped by the want of care, on the part of this Board, we propose to establish, in seeing that rules are carried out. Here is a case of an outport merchant who was loading a cargo of good fish to the westward. He was offered 76 shillings less 1% but he was not allowed to sell as regulation price was then 80 shillings. The best offer he has got since is 52 shillings. Just what that man may get I cannot say but it will result in a serious loss to him. A St. John's merchant tells me that he was offered, at the time of proclamation, 84 shillings but it was subject to a rebate of ¼%. He was not allowed to sell. He finally sold this cargo at 75 shillings and lost thereby. Now if these things have been done under proclamation, they can be repeated. There is no security whatever for a man who buys fish and exports it. In effect the result of this measure will be, if I am speculative enough to buy twenty or thirty quintals of fish the Minister of Marine and Fisheries tells me that by proclamation I am not to ship that and when time comes to sell, he is to name the price. It has to be vended through a special agent of his own. Human nature is human nature —and Hon. Mr. Coaker as Minister of Marine and Fisheries will probably see that stocks are large and that it is expedient to sell quickly, he will export his own and I shall have to wait until he has disposed of his stock. There is no rule laid down that he shall give others a chance of shipping. If he wills it there is nothing to prevent him from selling his fish first. Now not very long ago within the last three weeks a friend of mine in St. John's was offered 107 shillings for a cargo to be shipped to the Brazilian markets and to be paid when vessel arrived. This was contrary to regulations, and offer was refused. I contend if this man was willing to take the risk he ought not to have been refused. The Brazilian market to-day is as low as one hundred. An honourable gentleman in this House sold recently, he will be able to correct me if I miss-quote. The whole result is a muzzling of the trade of the country. There is

no precedent. It is for all the world like one of our buyers going home and finding that owing to a strike among the cotton spinners the price of that article is very high, he telegraphs New York and finds he can buy cheaper there. He consequently makes his purchase in New York. Our buyers will go to Iceland or to Norway or to France, or to Great Britain, which now has trebled her fisheries since the war ended. Fresh fish in the Old Country is now one cent per lb. Now it appears to me that if we accumulate stocks here it will be suicidal.

We must not suppose that our customers do not know what stocks we hold, for by a recent Bill passed here we were to give monthly statements of quantity in our possession. If this Bill is passed we destroy competition in the fisheries. And the statement made by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that he expects twelve dollars for shore and ten dollars for Labrador fish many gentlemen would scout at as impossible, and nothing short of a miracle. What has been the safeguard of the fishermen all these years but the competition of one merchant with another. We are going to drive a number of our large exporters into doing next to nothing. I have on the authority of three or four that they are not going to run the risk of production if they can make money and are refused by the autocrat in charge —Mr. Coaker, not as the Hon. Mr. Coaker but as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I can conceive he has an honest desire to benefit the fisheries of the country and when he was head of the sealers organization he was of untold value to the people he came to help, in sustaining the price by competition of trade, but as an exporter of codfish, one of the famous 'graballs' like Mr. Ryan, Mr. Templeman and myself. As soon as he became an exporter and consequently a 'graball' he could not serve two masters. He could not keep the price of fish at figure to give profit and drive it up to the utmost limit of its value. For these reasons we cannot seriously advocate this Bill. To sustain the price we require competition, we require to give those who are willing to run the risk of exporting a free hand. This Bill will ruin competition. Mr. Chas. Duder read an article from a Nova Scotia paper in the Board of Trade a while ago which stated that the opinion entertained there was that their fisheries had been improved considerably since Newfoundland had put arbiturary price on fish. We have now two thousand quintals of old fish overlapping the new fish. This must be disastrous to all parties—merchants and fishermen. For these reasons I am justified in moving as an amendment to this clause that we read this Bill six months from this date. If I wished to take the easiest course I could say 'Let it go,' for in the fall of this year the disaster would be so universal that it would condemn itself. I reduced my buying, when first the proclamation came out, fifty per cent. I shall limit my shipments to my own connections, that is, those to whom I have given supplies and those who have been in the habit of doing business with me, but I shall not be a competitor. If we persist in passing this Bill I view it as a great political blunder and a greater commercial blunder. I move that this Bill be read this day six months.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—Mr. Chairman, when first this matter of the Codfishery Regulations came up before the House, and the Hon. Mr. Grieve spoke on the measure I remember remarking that because of his great experience his opinions were entitled to a great deal of respect. I repeat those words, and I am sure this House will regard all the opinions expressed by the Hon. Mr. Grieve touching this or any other

matter relating to the fisheries of Newfoundland. I cannot, however, agree with the argument of my honourable friend. I am prepared to admit at the outset that the regulations formulated last year were far from perfect regulations, and I do not see how it could have been expected of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or any other man adopting a measure of that kind for the first time to provide a perfect measure. There seems, however, to me, sir, to be considerable safeguards in the Bill which we are now considering. In the first place, instead of the matter being entirely in the hands of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as my honourable friend would indicate, there is to be a Board composed of seven persons every member of which we are assured is to be a codfish exporter. The Governor in Council has the right to appoint four members of that Board, and we are told by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that these are to be exporters of codfish. Two others are to be nominated by the Board of Trade, and surely that will form a very fair representation of the exporting interests of the Colony. That Board will first of all start to recommend rules to the Governor in Council for

(1) The issue, holding, suspension and cancellation of licenses to export salt codfish.
(2) The conditions and terms of sale abroad.
(3) The minimum prices for the sale of salt codfish in particular markets at particular times.
(4) The maximum quantity of salt codfish which may be sold for or exported to any particular market at any particular time.
(5) The Board may also from time to time recommend the modification, suspension, or repeal of any rule already approved and published in The Royal Gazette.

so that the duties devolving upon the Board are broad and very clear, and any rule or any price that the Board may decide to adopt and have put into effect can be modified or changed the following week if necessary. That the Minister does not act as arbitrarily as my honourable friend would suggest was proven by a statement of his own that a short time ago when he approached the Minister upon a certain matter affecting his own business he understood the Minister acceded to his request, but that afterwards, a day or two subsequently, that tacit admission was withdrawn. This seems to me to prove, Sir, that the Minister does not act arbitrarily, but in that case in the meantime consulted some of the other members of the Board who thought that the permission that was asked for should not be given. Anyone who has any knowledge whatever of the export of fish will realize and appreciate the reason for that refusal. An attempt has been made and a serious attempt in the best interests of all concerned, to prevent the exportation of codfish to Brazil on consignment. It is generally accepted that to too many markets already do we export codfish on consignment, and I think it was a proper refusal, although it may have proven a considerable hardship. My honourable friend also referred to an outport man who was offered a price whcih he was prohibited fro mtaking, and that subsequently he had to sustain a very heavy loss upon a cargo of fish which he thought he had the chance of selling. Now, Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend knows that there is nothing new in quotations being made in the course of correspondence regarding the sale of codfish and the price intimated, but that it sometimes happens before the final closing of the negotiations that the thing falls through, and where a man might have sold for 110 shillings he will probably have to take 100 shillings or less. There is no-

thing new in that. And, furthermore, in reference to a cargo of Brazil fish which might have been sold, my friend says at 170 shillings, I have the same to say. Anything could have happened. I believe, as a matter of fact, I could have sold a cargo of Brazil fish not so long ago at 170 shillings, 6 pence; I sold it at 102 shillings, 6 pence, but I cannot blame the regulations. At first an attempt was made to obtain cash for the full value of the fish. That was a mistake. Now ninety per cent cash is to be got. You have to obtain payment to ninety per cent and ten per cent remains unpaid until satisfactory delivery in Brazil. But surely that is very much more satisfactory.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—Might I ask at this point in connection with the Bill, will this interfere with cash advances of banks here?

HON. MR. BISHOP:—That is entirely a question for the banks themselves as to what paper they will handle and upon what terms they will advance money. That is entirely apart from the regulations. To point out the value of the regulations I would refer to a quotation read by my honourable friend from a copy of an English paper. I do not know whether the honourable member took notice of that. It drew attention to the fact that an extremely low price for fish obtained in London at the time, and the article stated that this deplorable low price was due to want of organization. What does that mean? That if the trade had the proper organization they would be able to regulate the sale and price and obtain more for their fish than at present.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:--I do not want to interrupt, but I have gathered from the Debates of the House of Commons that the lack of organization is lack of transportation due to railway difficulties in the old country.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—Perhaps that is so. I am not going to occupy much more time of the House. With the prediction of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries as to price for fish, I do not agree. I cannot see what there is in the present indications to justify the assertions from any source that it is probable that we shall see a price of $12.00 for Shore fish and $10.00 for Labrador. I really cannot see any hope of our obtaining $10.00 for ordinary Labrador codfish. Moreover, I submit that should such price be obtainable for Labrador fish, then we might get $14.00 or $15.00 for merchantable Shore fish, which is about the relative value with $10.00 for Labrador. If people can get $10.00 for fish practically without cure and have to sell it dry with a loss of ten per cent, it is evident that nobody is going to the trouble of handling and rehandling codfish for many weeks when any man who gives it a couple of days' sun gets $10.00 a quintal. I think it is a serious mistake upon the part of the Minister b,ecause it is sending the fishermen away with false ideas. As to the statement that there will be no buyers for codfish next fall because of the regulations, I do not agree with that for a moment. days' debate in the Board of Trade the resolution that was passed there affirmed that regulations were necessary.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—What for?

HON. MR. BISHOP:—For the export of codfish. S urely the honourable gentleman remembers the resolution that was passed, and it was set out distinctly that certain regulations were necessary for the proper export of codfish.

HON. MR. GRIEVE,—The resolution set out that they were essential.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—Yes, essential. Then there was a prediction some time ago that there would be no supplies this spring. Now, I would like to

ask how much less supplies were given this year than last year.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—Thirty per cent.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—Well, perhaps that is so. It will be somewhat less than last year, I admit, because many men will find employment that they think safer. They can get good wages in different directions, and I am surprised that they are taking advantage of it. But the chances are that we will find we will have to deal with a voyage of codfish which will not be materially less than we have handled in other years, and I admit that with the competition of other countries it is going to be a very serious problem, but in spite of that, Sir, I think there is a better hope that we will be able to market our fish without disaster if these seven men that are to be appointed will work together in the general interest and fromulate rules, and regulations in their own interests as well as in the interests of the country generally. We will then find at the end of the season that we will be better off than if we continued the practice of allowing everyone to go on his own. I am of opinion, Mr. Chairman, that, speaking generally, the care that will be exercised under this Bill (Provided a Bill can be formed and you can get seven or eight exporters to agree to work upon that Board and sit down together in the earnest endeavour to market this year's produce of codfish) will cause us to think much better of regulations and the Board than some of us do at the present time.

HON. MR. RYAN:—Mr. Chairman, the Bill before the House is with regard to the exportation of salt codfish. Well, Sir, I agree with my honourable friend Mr. Grieve in all he said with regard to these regulations. I consider we have had enough of regulations, or rather, too much regulations, as to the sale and exportation of codfish in the past year, and now to bring forward another Bill is too much of a bad thing. We have more regulations than we know what to do with. I want to state a case as to the regulations of last winter. I had 110 casks fish which I wanted to sell in Liverpool. I wired my brokers in London to get the best price obtainable. I got a message back after two days saying that 65 shillings was the best they could offer. The regulation price was 70 shillings. I was quite willing to accept 65 shillings. I applied to the Advisory Board for a permit to be allowed to ship that fish. That was about the first of March, just before I left here on the sixth. I applied to the Advisory Board to get a permit to ship that fish, and in doing so I took a copy of my cable message which I sent to my brokers and their reply and showed them both those messages. I could get no permit to ship the fish. The regulation price was 70 shillings. I was quite satisfied to accept 65 shillings, but they would not allow me to ship. Mr. George Barr was one of that Advisory Board, and Mr. Barr said that 70 shillings could be easily got in London for that fish. I asked Mr. Barr if he would take it at 65. He would not buy it from me at 65. I said I would pay the expenses to Liverpool. No, he would not take it. I offered to seel at 60. I wanted to sell the fish and get the money. No, he would not take it at 60, but at the same time the regulation price was 70 shillings. They would not buy it at 65 or 60, but I had to send it to Liverpool and get 70. I had to ship it through Hawes and Company, which I did. When the fish got to Liverpool by the steamer which sailed from here on the 14th or 15th March, they could not get 70 shillings. It was shipped to Alicante and when it was opened there it turned out good, but it could not be sold. I called upon Hawes & Company several times to get the money for that

fish, but I could not get it. They sent it from Alicante to Valencia, where they were going to sell it quickly. I called upon Hawes & Company's agent here on the nd2 of June and asked him to cable London to Hawes & Company to know if they had paid my brokers for that fish and got an answer back from Hawes' agent here saying: "We beg to inform you that our senior advises us under date of the 3rd instant that Ryan's 110 casks not yet sold." I cabled the day before yesterday to my brokers to know if they could get the money from Mr. Hawes for this fish, and got an answer to-day saying the fish was still there unsold, but they could get no money. Now this will show you about the regulations. I daresay the regulations were alright up to a certain time last winter, but when Norwegian fish, French fish, and Iceland fish came into contact with Newfoundland fish they were useless. Mr. Hawes still kept his regulation price up, and I do not know if it is up to-day or not. However, there is this about it, that he has the fish in his store in Spain. Norway, France and Iceland came in and sold their fish broadcast. I am given to understand that Mr. Hawes got a fine lot of money last year from several of the exporters to build fish stores in Spain, Italy, Opporto, and Greece to put Newfoundland codfish in and keep it there I suppose to look at. Now if there were no regulations last year or they were lifted on the last of January I could have sold my fish at 65 shillings and got my money. Now I am without it, and there are scores and scores of shippers in the same position as I am. They were not allowed to ship their fish through anyone except Mr. Hawes on account of the regulation prices, and if Mr. Hawes had been given a free hand after the first of February he would not have as much fish in his stores in Spain as he has to-day, and it would have let the fish go tnto consumption and the money for that fish would be cabled over to St. John's. The Banks can tell stories if they want to. Now this is only one case and this is a case of my own, but there are scores and scores in the same position as I am with their fish over there unsold. The facts are simply these, that the regulation prices are wrong when you have to meet a lot of competition. You have to reduce the price. You cannot stick to the one price, because others will come in and sell under you. You can keep your goods if you want to. I agree with the remarks of my honourable friend Mr. Grieve in every particular. I know exactly what I am talking about with regard to the Advisory Board. I second the proposition of Hon. Mr. Grieve that we give this Bill a hoist of six months. The man who has fish over there in Spain unpaid for know more about this Bill than the man who has no fish.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I am a man who has no codfish, and I was expecting that some other gentleman connected with the staple industry of the country would make some observations, because I am a bit diffident about taking part in this discussion because I am not familiar with the exporting of or handling of fish. At the same time as a member of this House I feel it incumbent upon me to give a vote on this matter according to my best judgment, and I am not satisfied as yet as to the situation. This whole situation has arisen and developed during my absence, during the past 6 months, and I have never been able to get a real grasp and I am going to address a few questions to the Hon. Mr. Bishop if he will be so good as to answer them:— (a) If the regulations already in force were having any good results; (b) if the countries competing against us, like Iceland, Norway, France, etc., had any such legislation; (c) if, as the

regulations were partly intended to prevent sales on commission, what was the explanation of the case cited by Hon. Mr. Ryan; (d) if we put these regulations into force would not the result be that Canada and other countries would be able to undersell us in the foreign markets, and would not this be disastrous. Then I was very much struck with what underlay the observations of Hon. Mr. Ryan this afternoon as I gathered that one of the main objections to these regulations is that it does away with selling fish on consignment in such fashion that the money will not be obtained for several months after it leaves here. Ibelieve that practice is particularly applicable to Brazil and I admit that it would be much more desirable to adopt a scheme whereby people here could get cash against documents issued for the cargo. But according to the hon. gentleman the system of selling fish through Hawes is still in effect. Now what is the object of having regulations to put our fish in Hawes' hands and allow him to effect such a situation as that, namely, that Hawes has fish for several months and my hon. friend says he cannot get the money for it. Another thing is this: When these regulations were enforced—I was away but I think I am correct—the Board of Trade enforced the regulations and certain gentlemen accepted posttions on the Advisory Board in carrying them out. I find now that virtually every man who endorsed them last fall is gone back on them. I think it was since my return that two meetings of the Board were held at the first of which one gentleman expressed himself as favorable to regulations on which this scheme is based, but at the next meeting that gentleman went back and the whole of the fish exporters lined up in opposition to this scheme and declared rather for some scheme which they would handle themselves. I am free to say that of teh two propositions, that if it be a matter of handling through a bill administered by the Government, or by the fish exporters themselves I am for the Government, but I would like some explanation as to why all these people who were strong last fall for these regulations declared against them in the spring.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—They have seen the working of it.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Well, that may be, but there may be some other explanation. The Hon. Mr. Grieve in speaking of a cargo of fish which he says was sold at 98/ does he mean that somebody connected with the administration of the regulations owned that fish?

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—No, I said that despite the regulations the cargo had been sold at that. It was in the full knowledge of the Board and as far as I know, no action was taken.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Of course if that sort of thing is possible the whole thing would break down and Ithink we ought to have some statement by the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill in reference to that cargo which would make clear the manner under which sold, because if that sort of thing is allowed to continue it is just as well we go no further. To my mind we are approaching a situation in regard to our fisheries that calls for the most careful consideration of every member and I am sure it is getting that from every man interested in the fishery business. Yesterday I obtained a copy of the Annual Report of the Board of Trade for last year and I think it a pity that hon. gentlemen connected with this organization and with the fish business do not perhaps give as much attention to this matter or to the literature on the subject as they might. Apparently last July the Board of Trade adopted certain resolutions in regard to the handling of

codfish by such a process as is suggested here, and prior to that, in April last representations were made by the Secretary of the Board of Trade with a view to the Government having something done in the way of scientific research, and secondly, securing an improved cure. That letter was received and acknowledged by Hon. Mr. Halfyard, then Colonial Secretary, but apparently nothing followed. Now the Board of Trade, the policy of which I suppose I am safe in saying, is dominated by the Fish Exporters, wanted something and got something last November which was then satisfactory, but this is apparently not so satisfactory now. In the meantime the situation has worstened very seriously, as I see it.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—The proposed regulations were submitted by Mr. Coaker to a minority of the exporters.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I do not know when they were submitted, but they were put in force last November. It was not necessary for him to submit them to anybody.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—Matters were finally adjusted in the office of a solicitor in St. John's at which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was present.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—The fact remains the fish resolutions were endorsed by a meeting of the Board of Trade in January after two or three days debate. The Board declared in favor of some form of regulations. New regulations have since been put into effect and the fish exporters are a unit against them. I do not think I am mis-stating the position as to what happened at the last two meetings. Certainly hte Board declared against this Bill. Amendments have since been made which may have modified that.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—Nothing to do with this bill.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Pardo nme. At the last meeting the general features of this Bill were submitted and the meeting adopted resolutions declaring for some form of regulations arranged by themselves. One of the reasons I see a difficulty in venturing upon this novel policy is the fact that we are likely to be faced with keener competition in regard to our fisheries than ever before in our history. Some discussion arose here with regard to the enormous amount of fish being brought into Italy. I have here an authenitative statement made in the House of Commons less than two months ago, which I propose to read to the House. I follow perhaps more than anybody else the deliberations of the British Parliament. The Secretary for Agriculture and Fisheries was presenting the estimates for his department, Sir Arthur Boscasen, and I am sure the House will pardon if I read somewhat lengthy from his observations. (Read extract). Now this is briefly the statement, and the point I wish to make is this, that they are going to have in England for sale or consumption very much more fish than for years, and I take it that some of that fish is going to come into competition with our fish. I was present in the Board of Trade a few years ago and the subject discussed and one of the points made was that we would be threatened with more competition after the war than before. What has happened to that fish which owing to lack of proper transport has not reached the people it was intended to? Only about ten days ago a large quantity of it was actually taken out to sea and dumped overboard, it being impossible to convey it to the consumer. With these conditions, already mentioned, facing us, is it right or desirable that we should have legislation which would put it in the power of any Board to say when men should sell their fish? Nova Scotia competes with us on this side of the Atlantic, she does not on the other

side, to any great extent. The most of the competition is in South America and the West Indies. Once or twice during the war cargoes were sent to Europe—to Mediterranean ports by Nova Scotia. If we are going to enforce these regulations agains t our people selling fish in the West Indies, the Canadians are going to undersell us and take the market away from us. From another report I have received it is implied that Newfoundland has virtually lost the market in Northern Spain. It is explained that as a consequence of the shortage of fishing in the North Sea we had been able to gain that market now we were in danger of losing what foothold we had, through keen competition. If this legislation is going to help us, if Ican be satisfied of that, I shall support this Bill, if not I won't. We should have more information on these matters. Why not raise committee for this afternoon and take up matter next sitting. If we are not I should like to suggest an amendment in the first section—it makes no provision when or how the appointment ought to be made—that if convenient the first day of September should be chosen, otherwise we have no machinery for doing the business, likewise we have no provision for filling a vacancy, likewise no provision for any quorum if others do not get there. The whole administrative machinery should be on as absolutely unquestionable a footing as possible.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—I agree with the suggestion that committee be raised if there is to be any discussion. I should be glad, Mr. President, to have it stated with authority, whether this is a Money Bill or no. I do not consider it a Money Bill, myself, but others may think differently .

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—On the question whether this is a Money Bill or no, I may say, there was a time, Mr. Chairman, when this Bill might have been construed as a Money Bill. That time is past. Two years ago the Government called another session—and passed a Bill—known as Legislature Act of 1917—which dealt with the manner in which a Money Bill should be treated. The Bill lay fallon for over two years past August 1917. A few days ago for some reason, I don't just know, there was a proclamation in The Royal Gazette that the Legislature Act was going to be brought into effect. If this be a Money Bill it is not susceptible to amendment in this House. A Money Bill according to this Act should have appended a certificate of Speaker of the House of Assembly that it is a Money Bill. There is no certificate attached to this Bill, consequently this is not a Money Bill.

Committee on Bill entitled "An Act to Regulate the Exportation of Salt Codfish" rose and reported it had considered Bill and asked leave to sit again.

On motion of HON. MR. SHEA the remaining "Orders of the Day" were deferred.

House then adjourned until Monday 4 o'clock.

MONDAY, June 14th, 1920.

House opened at 4 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

On motion of HON. MR. SHEA the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Certificates of Masters and Mates," was read a third time, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the House of Assembly, that this House had passed same with some amendments.

On motion of HON. MR. SHEA, the House went into Committee on Bill, entitled "An Act to Regulate the Exportation of Salt Codfish."

HON. MR. MILLEY took the chair.

HON. MR. McNAMARA:—Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few observations on this Bill and whilst I am not a fish exporter or fish dealer I

am in common with all others deeply interested in our fishing industry, as I realize the fact that on the success or failure of this enterprise depends a good deal of the prosperity or otherwise of this Dominion. When we take the results in connection with last year's regulations of the fish markets into account I am convinced that the average citizen will be forced to admit that not only were the fishery regulations not a success, but that their enforcement will go down in Newfoundland history as a disastrous failure. What are the results? First there are roughly 180,000 qtls. of last year's fishery in the Dominion unsold—there are roughly 150,000 qtls. of last year's catch in the foreign markets unrealized making a total of 330,000 qtls. on this fish at a conservative estimate, there is likely to be a loss of not less than $6.00 per qtl. or aggregating in all a total of approximately—two million dollars. I do not say that all this due to the fishery regulations nor do I say that a good deal of it is, and further that if our fish had not been held up by fixed prices we could have unloaded our stocks like Norway, France and Iceland and would possibly have saved a goo ddeal of this money but for our want of foresight in demanding prices that market conditions did not warrant. When you will notice that our fishermen are traversing Water Street with yaffles of fish in their arms looking for purchasers at any price—most of our journeymen coopers are out of work owing to their being no demand for casks and barrels—Then again mill owners are hampered due to the fact that they cannot sell any of their cooperage stock—which they attribute to the absence of demand on account of no fish being exported in casks. I am prepared to admit that good may come of some of these regulations such as standardization and improvement of cure, and I go further and say that I believe the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Hon. Mr. Coaker, is earnest and sincere in his efforts to better fishery conditions but I claim as I already stated in this Chamber that you cannot satisfactorily control the price of a food product by legislation and I think it will be admitted that our present attempt to do so has resulted very much to the disadvantage of this country. I would like to inform this House that one of the greatest men this country ever produced—the late Sir Ambrose Shea—uncle of the present Leader of the Government here—and in later life Governor of the Bahamas—stated that the least legislation you had about the fishery the better, as conditions were continually changing and what suited this year did not apply at all to another season. With your permission, Mr. Chairman, I should like to read an extract or two from an interview in Saturday's "Trade Review" had with Mr. W. A. Munn. Mr. Munn is a large exporter of codfish to the Mediterranean and as he has just returned from viting Italy, Spain and Greece, this interview will be found of great interest at present juncture. Speaking of his experience with fish importers in these ports he says:—

"One important theme that I always kept to the front was that we now had a fisherman's Government in charge of our affairs, who intended to make things better than they have ever been in the past. They asked me how we intended to do this, and my reply was that we were going to improve the cure and ship them the quality of fish that they were looking for, so that they would have no further trouble with discontented customers. The invariable question was, 'what does your govern-'ment mean by fixing prices and forc-'ing us to make our purchases through 'one man?' It was a question that I could not answer, and neither can anyone do it satisfactorily, so I had to re-

vert to the Scotchman's perogative by asking another question. The following is an interesting conversation from my diary with one man, who understood the situation very well. I asked him if he did not think some control would be beneficial and he replied,—'What your Givernment is attempting 'is a 'Capitalist Control,' and if they 'think this can be carried out, they 'must 'corner' the fish market, and pur-'chase all the Norway, Iceland and 'French fish before they can dictate to 'us what price we must pay.' 'I am in 'favor,' he said, 'of an 'Intelligent Con-'trol,' so that the fisherman are shown 'how to put up a better cure, and with 'a proper inspection before it leaves 'Newfoundland, you will find that it 'will be money in your pocket as well 'as ours.' I asked him if he was in favor of having outright sales,' or sending the fish 'on consignment' to be disposed of to best advantage. He replied, 'No intelligent man would need 'a reply to that question. You kill your 'trade by sending fish forward unsold; 'there is only a very small quantity that 'can be sold in this way to good ad-'vantage each season. Then large con-'signments arrive and the buyers will 'get all they want at their own price.'"

A good deal in this interview agrees with statements made by me a short time ago in discussing these Fishery Regulations. For instance you will notice that it is claimed that in order to fix prices we would have to control the catch of Norway, Iceland, and France or in other words "corner" the fish of these countries and with our own fish endeavour to dictate prices to our customers in the Mediterranean, this was the very contention I upheld—that it is useless to fix prices of a food product unless you control it as Greece controls the currant industry for instance or as Manilla controls the raw rope industry. As far as consignments of fish are concerned I would control them to a certain point—but if the consignee would advance say 75% or 80% on the value of a cargo I would not prevent consignments on this basis although I would not be in favor at all of sending consignments free and to be at the mercy of the consignee for what he may be disposed to give in payment of your consignment. I am not in favour of these Fishery Regulations and will support the amendment of the Hon. Mr. Grieve.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—Mr. Chairman, if one could judge by the pessisimistic tone of the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, one would imagine dire disaster was going to overtake this country and the people as well. But the hon. gentleman's arguments are not borne out by facts. The hon. gentleman is sufficiently well versed in trade and business as it is being carried on in the different parts of the world to know that many countries have fixed a price upon the goods produced of a food commodity. In reply to that I might say that Canada has fixed the price of wheat. A price for sugar has been fixed and the countries producing same control both wheat and sugar. They find it necessary to do this in the interests of the country. In support of his arguments he read an interview with Mr. Munn in The Trade Review. I presume it is well known that Mr. Munn was the first to sell fish in the foreign market at a low price when there was no necessity for it. He could have obtained as high a price for his fish as those who had sold fish prior to him; but because of some circumstances which had arisen, he chose to undersell the fish that was being exported from this Colony by five or ten shillings when there was no necessity whatsoever. I would consequently remind the hon. member that when he quotes Mr. Munn as an authority he should not forget the fact that this is the gentleman who undersold the trade

here when there was no necessity, and the regulations were put in force for the purpose of keeping men lkie Mr. Munn from depreciating the price of fish and thereby causing loss to those engaged in the trade. Now the hon. gentleman who proposes an amendment to the Bill in support of the position he takes makes assertions, but these he does not bear out by facts or arguments, and in the absence of both of these, his assertions must fail. For instance he tells us that the making of regulations is at the dictum of the Minister. The presumption from what he says is that nobody else will have anything to say and that the matter will be in the hands of one person. Now the untruth of this must be manifest to all who have taken the trouble to study this measure; and if the hon. member will study the first section of the measure he will see wherein he has erred. It provides that there will be a codfish exportation Board consisting of seven members; the Minister of Marine and Fisheries ex-officio; four members, exporters of codfish appointed by the Government and two members appointed by the majority of the exporters of codfish. Members will notice that the members of the Board must be exporters of codfish; according to the assertions of the hon. member one must infer that men who are financially interested in the successful sale and marketing of our codfish are going to jeopardize the property and money which they have invested and bring loss upon themselves at the behest and dictum of the Minister. Could any position be more ridiculous? Could anything be more absurd than the suggestion that exporters themselves interested in the exportation of codfish are going to be so foolish as to barter away their own interests as fish purchasers and injure exportation. That is the position when my learned friend's assertion is worked out to its logical conclusion, and it is the most ridiculous one he could make use of. It is asserted that this Board immediately it is appointed will pass and require to be carried into effect certain rules and regulations without more. But that is not the case and hon. members who will read Section 2 will see that all rules made will have to be passed and approved of by the Governor in Council; and without this approval they cannot be put in full force and effect. Now can it reasonably and sincerely be assumed that the Government of the country in whose hands the destiny of the country is placed; whose hands the prosperity of the country must be a first charge upon, is going to deliberately pass rules and regulations and put the same into full force and effect, when these regulations are such as will have the effect of bringing loss upon the people of this country. That is Sir, the effect of the assertions of the hon. member who has just taken his seat. It is seriously suggested that the Government of this country is going to sit down and deliberately bring loss to the people of the country. You would not hear anything more revolutionary out in Russia. Do the hon. gentlemen opposed to this Bill presume that nobody has the interests of the country at heart except themselves? That nobody cares what will become of the country and whether its industries will be carried on at a profit o rat a loss? All are interested in the export trade of the Colony, becausecause it is on that trade that a country must live. If you cannot carry on business at a profit, but continue to do business at a loss; then you must very soon close up because in that respect the trade of the country is like the business of an ordinary man. Now this Bill I contend deals with very necessary safeguards, and provides power to deal with situations as they may arise. This is demonstrated by Sec-

tion 3. This section provides that new rules and regulations made will not effect any previous contracts entered into under rules previous and contrary to these. Safeguards are consequently in the bill which will protect the exporter of fish who may have entered into a contract under other regulations. Then Mr. Chairman, the idea that the working of this bill is to be at the dictum of the Minister is false, and that is very clearly shown by Section 5 of the Bill. There is nothing arbitrary about this Bill and this section shows this to be the case. The other assertion that the return to normal trade has taken place is equally unfounded. How the hon. gentleman could take that position I am at a loss to understand. Why, Sir, the United States Government is to-day considering taking over the United States railroads because of abnormal conditions. Not because of strikes and labor difficulties; but because of congestion in the moving of freight. A return to normal conditions with Europe seething with discontent? How can we expect normal conditions with conditions as they are. Hon. gentlemen know very well that it will be many years before we return to normal conditions; and until this time comes we will have to maintain regulations and control. Another contention of the hon. gentleman is that arbitrary fixing of prices will enable competitors to undersell us. He does not give us any particulars. But I would ask the hon. member: Can the people of Nova Scotia catch fish cheaper than those of Newfoundland? Are wages cheaper and less in Nova Scotia than in Newfoundland? Does it cost more to catch a quintal of fish in Newfoundland than it does in Nova Scotia? Does it cost less in Norway than in Newfoundland? Have the prices of commodities not advanced all over the world to even a greater extent than they have in Newfoundland? Are not some commodities being sold here to-day cheaper than the price at which they are being sold in Canada? The assertion of the hon. member that the arbitrary fixing of prices will enable competitors to undersell us, is not therefore capable of being borne out by facts.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—It has been amply proven already.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—In the case where unsuitable fish has been shipped, maybe; but not with good fish. One of the serious objections of the hon. member to this bill is that he feels he ought to be allowed to get for his fish whatever price he can. The sentiment of the hon. member was the sentiment of a good many people last fall. They thought they ought to get whatever price they could for their fish. But it was to prevent them getting any price they could that these regulations were introduced; and as a result they have been the means of doing a great amount of good. The hon. gentleman admitted that regulations were alright up to a certain period. His limitations have not been, as I have already said, borne out by the facts. The hon. gentleman must not forget that wages are higher in Europe and that therefore our people must receive what they earn.

HON. MR. RYAN:—Men's wages are cheaper in Norway. I have shipped men from there for the past 16 years and their wages are much cheaper.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—I think the hon. member must be in error. The wages of men in Norway are higher than in Newfoundland. The hon. member spoke of sending fish on consignment and getting a good price for it; but what does it mean? A delay of five, six or even nine months for our money. Why should we send fish on consignment: If we want to buy goods in the United States, have you not to put up your money in United States before they send you the goods? Why

not treat our own goods the same way. There is no reason at all why our Newfoundland fish should be offered to the market by consignment. There is no reason why we should do in the future what our old men have done and our young men have seen done in the past. We must become modern in our business. The hon. member then makes another assertion that this bill will control competition. But he does not say in what way. He does not attempt to reason why. This bill only fixes a minimum price at which fish is to be sold, so that the fishermen of this country will know before they prosecute the fishery just what price they are going to get for their fish. But I would point out to the hon. member that there is nothing here to limit the amount they can receive for their fish. There is no mention made of any maximum price. And then the hon. gentleman says that if the bill goes on the Statute Book, he will curtail his trade, and will only export certain fish, and I presume supply certain dealers, and not go into it generally. Well, of course that is the hon. gentleman's own business, but that is not going to deter the Government from dealing with this question should the necessity arise. The curtailment of the hon. gentleman's business while it may affect some gentlemen will not affect, I presume, the attitude of the Government in regard to what should be done in the interests of the trade of the Colony. The hon. gentleman who seconded the motion admits that the regulations were good up to a certain date, but when the time arrived for him to sell a quantity of fish in casks, the regulations stood in his way. He could get a certain price he tlels us but that price was a few shillings a quintal under the regulation price, and of course when the regulations interfered they were no good . That was the sum and substance of the hon. gentleman's argument. Well the hon. gentleman ought to take a broader view point of matters and look upon the world not so much for ourselves, but to make the world better than we found it. We must not live for ourselves, but reflect on the fact that even if we do meet a loss on an article that if that loss is in the general interests of the Colony we should bear it readily. If we live for ourselves alone we are performing a very small part in the world in which we live. The hon. gentleman should also take into consideration the fact that if the Board finds it necessary to make recommendations to the Governor in Council and the latter finds it necessary to follow the Board's advice that if there be a big catch in Norway or France, that all such circumstances will be taken into consideration; the question of what fish has to be marketed by the different peoples engaged in the production of it, the quality, &c., it will then arrive at what is best to be done under the circumstances. Now could anything be more reasonable or common sense than that? Is it possible to conceive of a bill that limits powers more than this bill does? And these powers will only be used when it becomes necessary, because that is the purport of the Bill. Another hon. gentleman quotes the congestion of fish in England as being a reason why we should proceed warily in matters of this kind. Well the price quoted by him at 2d. a pound is about the price we pay for fish at the fish stands here, so that the price is not a low one. A man may say I have a right to run my business as it suits me; what right has anybody to interfere with me as to the manner in which I conduct my business? But gentlemen engaged in business must remember that they are members of society and that they have duties as well as rights, and no man has a right to carry on trade or business to the detriment of the com-

munity in which he lives, or of those engaged in it. If a man so conducts his business so that it results in loss to those engaged in it, he should not be permitted to carry it on because a wrong is perpetrated on the community. Take the Labrador fishery in days gone by. What is its history but one of loss, of insolvency, of the men engaged in it? And why? Because there was no regulation or control over the manner in which it was run. Large quantities of fish were caught and each exporter rushed his fish to market, and the places where Labrador fish is marketed were often congested, there was twice the supply to meet the demand and there were all kinds of losses and rebates whereas if shipments had been regulated and controlled many a man who had to get out of it would have made money. But because all were trying to get the first cargo over there was congestion and men were ruined. It would have been a good thing for the carrying on of the Labrador fishery if they had had regulations of the kind in force last year. We must take into consideration in matters of this kind the chaotic condition that prevails in many of the countries to which we send our fish; that many of them are on the verge of bankruptcy. Conditions are unparellelled and we cannot expect trade and industry to be carried on with these countries in the same manner as heretofore. Governments the world over, rich and poor, are regulating and controlling trade and almost every department of the economic and industrial life. Nobody is anxious to control trade of course, except it be for the general good and well being of the country and people. Nobody wants to restrict the man or company in the way he carries on his business but if the Government permitted people to trade with countries verging on bankruptcy without some control, they would be very remiss in their duty. And it cannot be denied that the marketing of fish last fall was a very serious matter. Normal conditions of trade, with the enhanced inflation of paper currency in Europe more especially in markets where we sent our fish; the depreciation that has taken place; the high rates of exchange, make it absolutely to have control, and it is only a question of what is the best to be done. And I feel sure the Government is going to do what is best under the circumstances taking all the facts into consideration. Every country to-day is stock-taking so to speak to see what conditions are like, and after the signing of the Armistice the stock-taking of some of the countries shows them to be chaotic. No doubt there is a demand for food commodities of all kinds, more especially in Europe, and the only difficulty is the wherewithal to pay. Now I remember when the regulations were first promulgated I went down to see the late Hon. Mr. Goodridge and had a long talk with him because I wanted to get the benefit of his years and advice and he looked upon the regulations as very necessary, and though they were very essential, and that it might be necessary to have some sort of regulations for the coming year. I can quite appreciate the feeling of some hon. gentlemen in regard to the sundering of business and personal ties that must take place between those who have been carrying on trade and business here for years and what effect it must have on them to suddenly sever those social and business ties, but we must not forget that such changes are necessary and the motives must be good for the country. Fear and distrust have been argued as another reason, but who has sown the fear and distrust? The whole thing, as the hon. leader of the Government said a few weeks ago, has been made a political football of, and have been misrepre-

sented and distorted. Another statement of the hon. gentleman is that there is no precedent for the regulation and control of trade. Well the hon. gentleman cannot have read the history of his country because if he had he would know that the most prosperous time the people of England ever had was when its trade and industry was controlled. As the poet says:—(Extract). When the price of almost every article was controlled and profits fixed which each could make. Every department of its life, economic and industrial was regulated and controlled and that is the time the poet refers to.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—Not export prices.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—Certainly in the 14th and 15th centuries. We should endeavour to look upon this question from as broad a view point as possible because for the past five years we have been engaged in destruction, and now we are attempting a reconstructive period and it may be necessary to reconstruct in some manner the trade and business of the country ,and I know it is a delicate matter for hon. gentlemen to change opinions and ideas as regards the manner in which the trade and industry should be carried on. Men who have grown up with them, and they have been part of their very being for years. It is only reasonable to expect that they will view with disfavour any changes from the manner in which they have carried on their own business in the past. But I would point out that the present time is a time when all who have formed any serious notions as to the duties put upon them should forget differencies and unite not only to put away dissensions amongst us but bring home to people a realization of their needs and necessities. And one of the needs of this country to-day is a profitable export trade, and how that is to be carried out. I feel this Bill is the best and most reasonable that could be devised and I trust hon. gentlemen will see that and give it their hearty and united support.

HON. MR .BISHOP:—At the last sitting of the House the Hon. Sir P. T. McGrath seeking information I assume to enable him to give an intelligent vote on tis mihprottan pre 123456 123 vote on this important bill, directed one or two questions to me with a request that I should endeavour to answer them. Now I suppose it is well known to every member of this House tha the Italian Government last year with the object no doubt of procuring a food supply at the cheapest possible rate; decided to form what is called a Consorzio, what we should call a combine and selected a certain number of prominent codfish importers in that country to act in that capacity, proclaiming that codfish could not be imported into Italy except through the Consorzio. When that became known in Newfoundland exporters were naturally concerned and wondered how the situation could best be met, and after a good deal of consideration it was decided that fish export regulations must be promulgated and put into force and effect. We were up against a stone wall of opposition and that combine could only be met successfully by a combine at this end. A combination apart from Government control would have been, as previous attempts, useless and summoning certain members of the trade to his counsel and assistance the Minister of Marine and Fisheries decided upon certain rates that would be asked for our codfish. The price fixed, however, was not acceptable to the Consorzio and for a considerable time there was a deadlock. They said the price asked here was higher than they could afford to pay.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—I may say it was not a question of price but of terms. I can explain it if you like.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—The hon. gentleman has had a good deal of explaining already. I would submit however it was a question of price. Some what later in the season Mr. Hawes proceeded to Naples and had been there not more than 48 hours in consultation with the Consorzio when he wired that he had sold or could sell 150,000 qtls. of Newfoundland codfish. Up to that time not a cod's tail had been sold. There was then about that quantity of fish suitable for Italy afloat and all owners of those cargoes if so disposed could send them forward to Italy and the greater number of them went forward. Furthermore following the cargoes, as far as I am aware, all suitable cargoes and which have been available have been sent forward to Italy and realized on the whole fairly satisfactory results. If there had been no such decree in Italy respecting codfish, there would, I submit be more reason for the objections raised by certain exporters against these regulations, but it will be remembered that a meeting was called in February at the Board of Trade, all members being summoned, and a debate lasting three afternoons in which this matter was thrashed out very fully, and a vote then taken showed the decision of the Board as follows:—(Read extract). And I might say that prior to that time any exporter was at liberty to sell cargoes or part cargoes in any country with the exception of Italy. There was no restriction providing they obtained the minimum price, and I may say it is to my knowledge that fish was sold higher than the minimum price. Now there is the resolution passed by the Board of Trade after three days discussion.

HON. MR. WINTER:—Unanimously.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—Well I did not know that, but I know it would have been a very small minority if any. Now, Mr. Chairman, another question asked was should we have legislation at present in view of the competition: I would say it is because of the competition that the fixing of a minimum price is essential, and in support of that let me say that the House of Assembly deliberately passed this unanimously. This Bill has come to us after considerable debate in the House of Assembly, where it was unanimously voted for.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I understand that Bill was considerably modified. There were objections to the original Bill.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—The objections were remedied, and the Bill, as we now have it, was unanimously supported.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—Sir John Crosbie and Mr. Bennett dissented.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—In the Board of Trade only.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Sir John Crosbie made a strong speech against it in the Lower House but when division came he was not present. There were certain modifications made in the meantime.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—I will read the whole resolution passed by the Board of Trade. (Reads). The Bill that comes before us to-day was considered with due cognizance of that meeting of the Board of Trade. It does provide that all the members of the members of the Board be fish exporters and that a meeting be called the first week in September. (Every member has an opportunity accorded him to vote). In view of these facts I do not see how in any degree of justice it may be claimed that these regulations are contrary to the interest of the country or that exporters have not been safeguarded as far as is humanly possible. It is evidence that after hearing the explanation of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the members of the

House of Assembly were satisfied, and were prepared to give the Board a trial.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—One other point—that was with reference to my hon. friend's cargo of fish—the consignment to Liverpool.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—The price in Liverpool was 70 shillings per swt. Several parcels had been sold at 70sh. I do not know exactly by whom, but I assume these people were in the same boat as I was myself. I had a parcel of fish to dispose of. My agent wrote me saying he could not attain 70sh. now but could probably sell at 68. Having no authority to do this he did not sell. I wrote him saying he must hold it for 70sh. Mr. Ryan's agent sent fish to Spain expecting he would get an equivalent price there or better. I subsequently sold my fish in Liverpool at 70sh. I do not know what happened Mr. Ryan's fish, he thought it was sold, but found it was not and suffered a loss. This is the fortune of war. His agent acted as he thought to his best interests. He might have gotten more than equivalent of 70 sh. and Mr. Ryan would have been very pleased indeed.

HON. MR. RYAN:—My agent had nothing to do with it. It was done without my consent. They sent it to Alicante from there back to Valencia where it is now.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—This is evidently a disagreement between Mr. Ryan's agent and Mr. Hawes, and has nothing to do with the regulations. Reference made to the cold storage on the other side reminded me that in the early months of 1919 Mr. Wm. Ashbourne sent forward a large cargo of fish to an Italian port, and being unable to obtain a bid, there being no sale, decided to send it back to Alicante. The sale for Labrador fish was over so it was then put in the cold stores, to which Mr. Ryan refers, and through this action of Mr. Hawes on behalf of Mr. Ashbourne, he was able to sell his fish and get a price which must have saved him from a loss of $100,000. If during those hot months it had not been taken care of in this way it would have rotted. But for those cold stores it would have been at the bottom of the sea. It is a fortunate thing for Mr. Ashbourne and others that Mr. Hawes had the foresight to provide cold stores in Alicante. I feel, Mr. Chairman, it is quite unnecessary to spend more time in defending the Fishery Regulations after the lenthy debate. The unanimous decision of the Board of Trade that the regulations of the price of fish was essential. The House of Assembly passed this Bill with unanimity. It is now before us for our action, I cannot fear, that in view of these facts that the members of this Chamber are not going to see that the action of the Government and particularly the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is in the interest of the fish industry of the country. The Board are watching from month to month and week to week and altering regulations if necessary from time to time. I feel sure, Sir, that this House is going to support this Bill.

HON. MR. TEMPLEMAN:—I wish to make a few remarks on this subject. We have heard a lot outside. There have been lots of rumours. I was in favour of these Regulations, but I was not satisfied that they had been done just in the right kind of way. We must remember it is easy to pull down but it takes strong men to build up. It is all right to criticise. Some have suffered from those Regulations. I do not myself like the idea of having to ship all my fish to one concern. I believe, however, the Regulations were wisely gotten up. Our competition with other markets must be considered. We must not be out-distanced or undersold by our competitors, or we shall be left be-

hind. Loss in some cases has been due to storms, and the Regulations have been blamed. Before Regulations were made 70 sh. was often the price paid for fish. Now the price goes to 85 or 90 sh. or over. There is no good in blaming the Regulations. The main market they affect is the Brazilian market, and there we have been outdistanced by our Halifax friends.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—It is Newfoundland fish they have sold.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Cannot our people sell it as well as the people of Halifax?

HON. MR. BISHOP:—I shall answer that question presently.

HON. MR. TEMPLEMAN:—Now then we have to crawl before we walk and walk before we run and in the process of learning we have many falls—we make lots of mistakes. It is the same with the Regulations. Mr. Coaker according to this first paragraph is subject to his Board, he is not able to do as he likes: He has to abide by the decision of his Board. Looking at the Bill from that standpoint one man does not "rule the roost." We all know that this past year the fish was caught much later than other years. Now, Sir, if we are sincere and honest the Regulations ought to be a great benefit. Quarrelling does not do much good. People are not satisfied to give a true account of the amount of fish—the newspapers are a curse—there is no need of deceiving people. Some years ago there was great talk about sending over a proper kind of scale to weigh the fish on the other side. Sometimes a cargo is four hundred or two hundred quintals short. A old-fashioned scale, their grandfathers had, they are weighing fish with in Italy now. In Leghorn, Fairbanks' platform scale is used. The shortage in the weight could be remedied if proper scales were used. Since sitting here this afternoon and hearing what has been said I am more in favour of the Regulations. I cannot say I suffered in any way with regard to them. My loss has been due to storms. I do not believe though in putting all our fish into one hand. Why should we go back on people who have been doing their best to please us for the past twenty years? On one occasion Mr. Hawes telegraphed asking permission to sell at 28sh. 6d. a quintal less. We saw a signed agreement. Some claim this was not legitimate. It would be a good thing if we had inspectors from Europe, from the different markets to inspect our fish here before going across. There is one good thing the first section says,—"There shall be a codfish exportation board."

HON. MR. BISHOP:—In answer to the question asked by Sir P. T. McGrath in regard to the fish exported to Brazil from Halifax. If a firm in Brazil bought a cargo of fish, for many years the bill was payable after the arrival of the ship in the port of Brazil, by a "ninety day bill," the Fish Regulations demanded that 90% be paid down. One large importing firm had kicked against the Regulations and would not buy a cargo and have not bought since. They applied to the large fish handlers in Halifax, which were prepared to sell them a cargo, at what price I do not know, I presume an equivalent one to that which we were asking. They came to some terms afterwards with Halifax concerning the sending of cargoes to Brazil and not having fish enough to supply she had to buy from Newfoundland. Our own vessels freighted it to Halifax.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I wish to express my thanks to the hon. gentleman opposite for the light thrown on this subject, to my very great satisfaction. I have a much better grip of the matter than I had on Friday. There is just one question which he did not answer, that in a measure involves a problem if this scheme is to be a suc-

cess—that is—whether our rivals and competitors have any machinery of this kind in existence. If they have not I should think that is going to operate seriously against the experiment. After hearing discussion, I am disposed to support the Bill.

HON. MR. MEWS:—I should imagine Norway has Government control, as there they have Government factories.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I am not sure that they go so far as that; but I think one people catch the fish and another lot cure it.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—As regards the Government regulations I am unable to say anything; but it will be noticed that a consignment of Norwegian fish has just been landed at Oporto. That was put there by the British Government.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I think that is generally understood. This is fish bought by the British Government during the war to keep it from reaching Germany. Now they are dumping it on the market to realize on it. From the hon. gentleman's argument I gathered that the Consorzio started only last fall. He must be mistaken. The Board of Trade report says that it was formed shortly before the armistice in the fall of 1918. Our struggle continued all the summer of 1919. No regulations of a Government character were introduced, but the Hon. Sir John Crosbie worked out a system. This system continued to work until 1919 when new regulations became necessary. The Consorzio refused to buy.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—I can explain that. In the early part of 1918 the Italian Government agreed with a number of merchants and formed a Consorzio. At that time Hon. Sir John Crosbie was Minister of Shipping. The trade generally objected to the terms upon which the Consorzio agreed to buy. They offered us the price but demanded a retension of 20 per cent. until the cargoes were landed and approved. In other words if short of weight or inferior, the bankers retained 20 per cent. on the value of the sale. The trade here would not agree to that and consequently we lost all business with Italy that year. In 1919 the Consorzio still held out until in October Mr. Hawes visited the country and he made arrangements whereby he undertook to sell large quantities of fish to Italy subject to his sole control. He held out that he would receive payment in full, but he afterwards sold subject to twenty per cent. retention. In other words what was done in 1919 was practically the same as that done in 1918. Only for that period the amount sold was about one hundred thousand quintals, for which they paid eighty per cent cash and held the remaining twenty per cent. over. I am inclined to think moreover that most of that twenty per cent. was deducted.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—In other words then if I understand the hon. member correctly, Mr. Hawes sold the fish at terms which had been refused by our shippers.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—The difference between the terms arranged by Mr. Hawes and the other offer was that under the Hawes agreement the full payment was deposited in London, and the twenty per cent. instead of being held in Italy was held in London. When once Mr. Hawes was appointed no fish could be sold but through him; therefor no individual shipper was free to export to Italy. But all shippers had an equal chance, and no discrimination was practiced at all.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—However, with regard to the main issue, it is correct as I pointed out the other day the Board of Trade and Fish Exporters favoured regulations. As far back as July last they met and called

for them. In November regulations were put into effect and an attempt made to deal with the question. At the time there was a great deal of criticism and the next development was in January or February when a three days discussion took place as a result of which it was agreed that regulations were desirable. Later in May a different position was taken, namely that the trade should have control. Well, as I said here before, I would prefer Government control to trade control at any time. I would prefer the Government to have control than the merchant. It is true as has been stated here that there was substantial unanimity in the other house when this bill passed but I was struck with the fact that the two or three points set forth when the bill was introduced into this Chamber were points introduced as a result of the criticism in the other House. In the original bill this committee consisted of five members: three to be appointed by the Government; the Minister of Fisheries, and one appointed by the Trade. As a result of the criticism this Board was enlarged to seven, as follows: The Minister, four appointed by the Government and two by the Board of Trade. But now all those so appointed have to be codfish exporters. The next point was with regard to contracts already in being, and this bill shows a very material change in this respect. Thirdly in the original bill there was no provision for a meeting of exporters generally. This is an amendment secured by the opposition. So it will be seen that very good amendments have already been added in the other Chamber, and I have no doubt but that when we get into the details of the bill we will be able to still further improve it. I do not know whether this bill is going to have the effect which the Minister has hoped. As I have said this is legislation of an experimental character; and because it is bona fide introduced with an idea of improving conditions, it is a bill which will have the support of this Chamber. I must confess that I doubt whether the other bill of this nature will have the success hoped for, especially in view of the fact that whatever may be said, it is not going to be a very easy matter to make an experiment of that kind successful. Fish is different from wheat. The price of wheat was raised because there was not nearly enough wheat to go around. That is why Canada came in and added forty or fifty cents to the price. That is the difference between Newfoundland and Canada. The next question referred to in this connection was the question of sugar. The situation in sugar was practically the same. Ihappen to have some knowledge of this matter as a result of my experience with the Food Control Board. Virtually the great mass of sugar is now produced in Cuba. During the war the control was not by individual governments. There was formed an International Sugar Board. I had to get in touch with that Board and it was only because it was international that they could do anything. There is another way of dealing with the Consorzio in this matter and that is by polling our fish, selling it and distributing the proceeds pro rata. However within the next two or three years we will have an opportunity of seeing just how this plan works out. If it works out we will all get the benefit; if it doesn't we will have to pay the price. For this reason I am going to support the Bill, but as I have already said to the hon. member I hope to suggest several amendments when we take up the Bill section by section. Before I take my seat I might suggest that the motion before the House be amended or withdrawn. A motion for the second reading six months hence is not in order at this stage of the Bill.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—I recognize

that this motion is not in order. However I do not press it.

The Committee rose, reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

The remaining orders were deferred.

The House rose until to-morrow at 4 o'clock.

TUESDAY, June 15th, 1920.

House met at 4 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

On motion the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act to Regulate the Exportation of Salt Codfish."

Hon. Mr. Milley in the Chair.

HON. MR. RYAN:—Mr. Chairman, I wish to reply to the remarks made by the Hon. Mr. Bishop last evening as regards the great sale of fish made by Mr. Hawes last fall when compared with the sale of two or three cargoes by Mr. W. A. Munn. Mr. W. A. Munn sold two or three cargoes of fish, I understand, at 85 shillings per quintal net. He sold his fish talqual; the money was remitted direct to the Bank of Montreal here, Mr. Hawes made a sale of a large quantity of fish at ninety shillings and a very short time afterwards those who had fish on that steamer were called upon to agree to a reduction of two and six per quintal on the cargo, which we all agreed to. Then we would get 87s. 6d. for the cargo of fish. I have in my hand now account sales rendered by Mr. Hawes for some of that fish, and I find instead of getting 87s. 6d. which we thought we would get, a rebate was taken off the greater part of the cargo. First to commence with, there was a rebate of 6 shillings a quintal off some of the cargo, then 1s. 9½d. demurrage. Take that from 87s. 6d. and you have the price that he sold the fish for in this one case. In another case 2s. 6d. per quintal was taken off. Add to that the 1s. 9½d. and you have 4s. 3½d. off the 87s. 6d. Another account sales shows an abatement of 8s. 6d. Add to this the 1s. 9½d. demurrage, and you have 77s. 2½d. for the fish. These are only a few cases, but I have heard of others who had 4 shillings abatement, some 3 shillings and some 5 shillings. So, to compare Mr. Munn's sale with Mr. Hawes', why certainly Mr. Munn made a great sale. He sold these two or three cargoes talqual for 65 shillings, having the money remitted to the Bank of Montreal. We got from Mr. Hawes 75% on that fish when it left here and the balance was paid a few months later. I was informed in London in April on pretty good authority that two or three cargoes of fish had been sold at two shillings per quintal under the regulation price. I do not know if this is correct, and I beg to ask the honourable the leader of the Government if he can get this information for me, because I would like to know whether it is true or not. The man outside is generally in the dark as to what is going on on the Advisory Board. But if one man is allowed to sell his fish at two shillings under the regulation price, then it goes to show that there is no fair play in it. I contend, Sir, that every man should be allowed to sell his own produce and handle his own goods as best he can. I am opposed to any regulation prices in the foreign market, because they will not work satisfactory. We have too much competition now with other fish, and one must be prepared to meet them in prices, otherwise we will be driven out of the market. Now, as I understand it, Mr. Hawes last April cabled here to Newfoundland asking to be given a free hand to reduce his prices. He saw the fish lying in his stores while others were selling, and he asked that he be given a free hand, and he did not get it. I am opposed to the Advisory Board and also to the Fishery Regulations, and I shall thank the honourable

leader of the Government if he can give me this information which I ask for, if it is true that two or three cargoes of fish had been sold by an exporter at two shillings below the regulation prices.

HON. MR. SHEA:—Last winter?

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—In what market?

HON. MR. RYAN:—Well, in a foreign market. It went to Spain, I believe. I got it on fairly good authority, but I would like to know whether it is correct or not. If one or two can sell cargoes under regulation prices, where are the others? Are they to be handicapped? They would not allow me to sell 110 casks at 65 shillings; they were going to get seventy, and now they cannot sell it at all. We have had enough of regulation prices, and I am of the opinion, Sir, that next fall you will see lots of fish in St. John's in November that will be unsaleable. Time will tell.

HON. MR. ANDERSON: — Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few remarks on the Bill before the House. Ever since the Island was discovered very little regulations as to the catch and cure of fish have been formulated, and never has any interest been taken by any Government as to the regulation of the curing and export of the produce of the country. I have in my hand three Bills that have passed the Lower House, and these three Bills are the three reasons why I support the Bill before the Chair. In the first place we have a Bill that passed the Lower House unanimously. I refer to the Bill with respect to the standardization of fish. We had a second bill, an Act to provide for the better obtaining of information respecting the codfishery, which is a sequence to the first bill. After the fish is cleared and the quality prepared, the Minister denies information from all around the country as to the catch and quality. The bill before us to-day is for the regulation of the export of codfish. So far as I am concerned, I can only re-echo the explanation given yesterday by Hon. Mr. Bishop. In the export of a food commodity, more particularly the national commodity of this country, we must at least have some regulation as to the price we should get in the foreign market. There should be the greatest harmony and good will amongst the exporters, because we want co-operation in the exportation of this national product. I must admit there are objectionable features in the bill, but it is of an experimental nature in the fixing of prices on our exports. As I have stated this is an unusual bill but at the same time I am prepared to support it in its entirety to give it a trial. So far as I am concerned I have no direct interest in the exports of the country, but believe a united effort should be made to uphold in the foreign markets a standard price for our fish. It is the only time to my knowledge in the history of this country that an earnest endeavour has been made to standardize the quality of fish and export it at a price that will pay not only the exporter but the catcher of the fish. With these few brief reasons I support the Bill.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—I would like to make a few remarks regarding section one which provides for the appointment of an Advisory Board to work in concert with the Minister. Having worked for about nine months on a similar Board which was recruited from the ranks of the exporting merchants, I can speak with some authority on the nature of the business they have to undertake. Added to our own onerous duties as citizens which we have to discharge in different services, we had to take on this duty of the Escasoni's cargo which took us four or five months to accomplish, involving three meetings a day sometimes and

even meetings on Sunday. We found at the termination of our work that three of the members of this Advisory Board were so completely worn that they needed a rest. We were handling 60,000 qtls. of fish, and found the duties very onerous. This Committee which is proposed to be established will be required to give their attention to 1,500,000 qtls., and that onerous job will not, in my opinion, be as well carried out as under the present system of twenty or thirty people managing their own business. Therefore if these me nare not prepared to give up their usual association, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not prepared to divorce himself from residence in Catalina and stay in St. John's, my opinion is that the work will be very incompletely performed, and I have not come across any clause in the Bill which compels the Minister to be governed and guided by a majority of the views of his colleagues. If therefore the views of a majority of his Advisory Board does not accord with the views of the Minister, I have not read in this Bill any clause by which he has to give attention to their views, and he will then be an autocrat, Minister on the one side, and Hon. Mr. Coaker, President of the F.P.U., on the other, and I do not know, but I shall think that the interests of the F.P.U. will not suffer at the hands of the Hon. Mr. Coaker, and rather the interests of the country at large will suffer than the interests of the organization under his control. It appears to me from the remarks of hon. gentlemen that this Bill is going to pass this House, based on a variety of opinion, one of which has been voiced by two hon. gentlemen, Hon. Mr. Bishop and Hon. Mr. Anderson, who are prepared to give it a chance. Well it appears to me that the stake with which we are gambling is a very big stake, and we are jeopardising the interests of the Colony for an experiment which may turn out badly. There are no specific reasons adduced why we should do this. We are starting out on a new country. Hon. Mr. Gibbs stated it had been tried in the 13th century in Great Britain and did not tell us if it had succeeded or failed.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—It was a complete success for centuries up to the 15th century. The hon. gentleman will find many writers who stated that trade was carried on better than since.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—As to export prices?

HON. MR. GIBBS:—Yes.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—It was tried in recent years in Norway; I am speaking on the authority of the Norwegian Consul. What I feel on this matter is this, that if we hold the unbrella over the heads of those who are competing with us, we shall be left at the end of the season full of a perishable commodity, while our competitors, Norway, France, Iceland, Canada, America and Japan, all largely producing and increasing every year, will profit to our discomfiture. That is what I am afraid of. I stated earlier in the session that if I were a politician and wanted to see the present Government injured by the passing of such a bill, I would support it, but I am convinced outside of politics that this Colony will suffer if it passes the measure. I had intended to refer to the statements of Hon. Mr. Bishop and others yesterday but do not want to delay the House. I am speaking now on the principle of the Bill which I consider a very bad one which I do not find attempted in recent years in any adjoining country, and that we should essay such a step at this time is in my opinion a very dangerous proceeding.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I wouldsuggest to the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill that as the debate on the main principles of the Bill is pretty well exhausted we ought to consider a

variety of amendments which ought to be made. Now as regard section one, while it provides for a Board, it does not say how or when. My suggestion was that they should be appointed at the meeting in September when the Minister calls the exporters together. Then there is no provision for filling up temporary or permanent vacancies. That is a provision I think we should all recognize, that every member of the executive board has been out of the Colony since the regulations were put into force. I think I am safe in saying that there was no time when there was not one or two away. I suggest that power should be given for somebody to act in place of those who may be away. All these matters should be gone into before the bill leaves this House; otherwise it might prove unworkable in some cases. In section 3 there is provision that when rules are changed there should be immediate notice. I think there should be a requirement there that that should be done by telegraph. In section 4 it provides for licenses to be granted to any applicant who complies with the rules made under this Act. I do not think that that is what is intended, because it is obvious that they cannot comply with rules before the season because they do not know what they are. Sub section 2 sets out that licenses shall be in force for one year only from date of issue thereof. It might be that you would have people operating under licenses of different periods and I would suggest that licenses be issued for one calendar year or fiscal year. Sub-section 3 provides that licenses shall be suspended or cancelled by the Governor in Council for non-compliance or breach of the rules. Apparently the only penalty is cancellation or suspension. There may be other offences and there should be provision for a fine for nominal or technical breaches of the Act. Section 5 I suggest should have a clause added which would enable the exporters to appoint the two men to be on the Board. They are to be appointed by a majority of the fish exporters of the country holding licenses under this Act. They are to meet once a year and I suggest that is the time to appoint their representatives. Section 6 I might say meets the contention raised by Hon. Mr. Grieve as to the powers of the Minister. Neither the Board or the Minister can do anything, but the power rests in the hands of the Governor in Council. The Minister is bound under that section to respect every decision of the Board. He is not bound nor is the Governor in Council to act upon them. Otherwise it would destroy the whole principle of constitutional authority under which the Colony is governed. The Executive Council and the Governor in Council must be the last authority. That is so well established a principle that I do not think it can be disputed. Section 7 however seems to me to be the most peculiarly constructed in the Bill. (Read section). Now on analysis that will be seen to be a most preposterious composition. Suppose there are fifty exporters and at $50 each that is $2500 altogether. There is no appeal clause such as in the Bill which we passed for Securing of Information Regarding the Codfishery. It might be well, if after others who wish to speak have spoken, in order to expedite matters, to send this Bill to a Select Committee.

The Committee rose and reported that it had made some progress and asked leave to send same to a Select Committee.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—The Committee has not asked leave to sit again. When it goes into Select Committee what becomes of it after that? If it is to come back to this House must we not ask leave to sit again?

HON. MR. PRESIDENT:—I take it

this Bill is not disposed of by the Committee sitting on it now.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—No such motion is necessary. When Bill is sent to a Select Committee it usually means to kill it. There is no intention that it should come back, in the first place. In the second—the Committee on its own account may decide to report.

HON. MR. BISHOP:—The Committee must report.

On motion of HON. MR. SHEA the House resolved itself into Committee on Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Preservation of Beavers."

Hon. Mr. Templeman took the chair.

HON. MR. SHEA:—As I stated when moving the second reading, this Bill authorises the killing and trapping of beavers in certain areas. Any person wishing to hunt, kill or trap beavers must secure license to do same from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries from whom all licenses must come. The Bill has been introduced at the request of the inhabitants of Bay Despair and St. Barbe District where beavers are increasing to such an extent as to do damage. We are looking to the value of these skins to form a nucleus of a fund to be named the "State Insurance Fund." I am not in a position just now to give much information regarding this fund. The profits of this business is to establish this fund, whereby fishermen may take out insurance.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—There shall be no trade in beavers but through the Department of Marine and Fisheries. What inducement is there to kill the beavers. The intention is to cut down the number of beavers and the inducement is that when they have killed them they are to send them to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—So that we can keep control of the killed, we can do that. The skins have all to be sold to the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

HON. MR. MEWS:—Section 2 provides for the limiting number of beavers to be killed.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—The Government has not adopted any policy beyond this?

HON. MR. SHEA:—No.

Committee rose and reported having passed this Bill—without amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time to-morrow.

On motion of HON. MR. SHEA the House went into Committee on Bill entitled "An Act Concerning Former Enemy Aliens."

Hon. Mr. Mews took the chair.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Is this sent out by the Imperial authorities?

HON. MR. SHEA:—It is a Bill corresponding to that Bill passed in Overseas Dominions.

Committee rose and reported having passed this Bill without amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time to-morrow.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—In moving the second reading of Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Licenses to Cut Hard Wood," I may say it is a Bill to encourage a new industry. Within the last couple of years there has been a demand in the world for birch and witch-hazel veneer. These woods make an excellent veneer, and there is already one concern operating. Our object is to encourage this industry as it is one of some promise. I beg to move the second reading of this Bill.

The Bill was then read a second time and referred to Committee of the whole House to-morrow.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—On moving the second reading of Bill entitled "Of the Prosecution of the Seal Fishery," I desire to point out that the intention of this Bill (Section 3 o fthe Act already in force) provides for the proper kind

and quality of the food to be supplied sealers prosecuting the seal fishery, but it does not provide the machinery for the purpose of seeing the provision of Bill carried out. A case came up before court, some time ago, in which some sealers were arrested in connection with the prosecuting of the seal-fishery after a certain length of time. During the course of the evidence given some things were stated concerning the condition under which these men worked. The conditions were of such a character that I think some provisions of this Bill are the outcome. This Bill provides that no steamer shall be cleared for the seal fishery unless it be provided with proper food ,a certificate to this effect has to be given by the inspector who is to be appointed under the Act. Sub-section B provides for the inspector. He shall be regarded as a member of the crew, but shall be entitled to the same share of seals, he shall not be requested to do any other work but such duties as are defined in this Bill. These duties are,—he is to superintend the loading on board the steamer of regular supplies, he is to inspect the quality of food. He is to inspect the sleeping quarters, if necessary take it upon himself to draw up rules and regulations for the sleeping quarters, and he is to see that regulations are carried into effect. He shall be entitled to such assistance as may be necessary to give effect to these rules and regulations. The next important provision in Bill is that no seal shall be killed after a certain time. I propose to offer an amendment when Bill goes into Committee, this section is not full enough. I move that this Bill be now read a second time.

Second reading of Pilotage Amendment Bill.

HON. MR. SHEA:—I beg to move the second reading of this Bill. The object of this Bill is to change the maximum pilotage payable from $60.00, which it now is, to $80.00, so that large vessels will pay $80.00 instead of $60.00 as now.

HON. THE PRESIDENT announced that he had received a message from the House of Assembly acquainting him that they had passed the following Bills, entitled,

An Act Respecting the Maintenance of Certain Public Roads;

An Act to Provide for the Observance of Commemoration Day;

An Act Respecting Local Affairs in Outport District;

An Act to Amend Chapter 108 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled "Of the Protection of Animals," and requesting the concurrence of the Council in the same.

On motion the Bills were read a first time and ordered to be read a second time on to-morrow.

HON. THE PRESIDENT read a communication from His Excellency the Governor informing the House that leave of absence had been granted to the Hon. Mr. Steer for the remainder of the session.

(Names of Committee on Salt Codfish Exportation Bill).

On motion the Council adjourned until 4 p.m. on Thursday, June 17th, 1920.

THURSDAY, June 17th, 1920.

House met at 4 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—Before proceeding with the order of the day I should like to ask for further information in reference to the question I asked on April 29. I may say that from the beginning of the war to the taking over of the department by the Minister of Militia, I was actively engaged on the Executive of the Finance Committee, before whom all the bills of the department passed and were initialled by the members thereof. That

work was done by Major Howley and a few clerks, but was very efficiently done, and on taking over the departmen by the Minister the returns were absolutely correct in every particular and the Committee have a clean record from the Auditor General. On the 29th of April I asked for returns of the medical department and the services for which the expenditure was made. I have a portion of that which so far as it goes is fairly satisfactory, but there is another portion which I have been asking for and the leader of the Government has handed me what purports tobe the returns. I will read the accompany letter of Lt. Col. Rendell. (Read letter). I may say that that does not in any way fulfill what I asked for. The chief point regarding my question is the services rendered for the monies paid. I do it because of the knowledge obtained on the Executive Committee of the Patriotic Association. On that Committee the bills of the Militia Department were passed before the Executive members of that Committee consisting chiefly of Mr. Grieve, Sir Michael Cashin, as Chairman, Sir Patrick McGrath and the late John Munn and myself. We did the work of that Committee; others occasionally dropped in and I know something of the department, and I may state that if the leader of the Government will be good enough to place this matter in the hands of Major Howley I will get what I require in a very few hours. I do not want to comment on any others but I know Major Howley is only too well acquainted with what I want and know what I want it for.

HON. MR. SHEA:—I may say I will have much pleasure in adopting the course the hon. gentleman suggests.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—Thank you.

On motion of HON. MR. SHEA the Bills respecting the Preserving of Beavers and Concerning Former Enemy Aliens were read a third time and passed and ordered to be sent to the Assembly with a message that this House had passed the same without amendment.

House went into Committee on the Bill respecting Licenses to Cut Hard Wood, Hon. Mr. Power in the chair.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—This Bill is to encourage a new enterprise in our lumbering industry. Within the past year certain parties in the Colony have attempted the manufacture of veneer from birch and witch-hazel and have met with splendid success. They have found that these woods make a splendid veneer and have found a ready market for their output in England and the United States. There is nothing in the Crown Lands Act by which we couldgive them these woods. The object in introducing this Bill is to give the sole right to these people, to whom licenses have been granted, of cutting birch and witch-hazel for the purpose of manufacturing veneers. It does not permit ship-biulders from cutting these woods, but it would prevent other veneering concerns from entering on these particular areas. It makes provision against the common idea of timber gambling wit hregard to these woods. This Bill is really an amendment of the Crown Lands Act.

Committee rose and reported having passed Bill without amendment, and it was ordered to be read a third time tomorrow.

On motion of HON. MR. GIBBS the House resolved itself into Committee on Bill entitled "Of the Prosecution of the Seal Fishery."

Hon. Mr. McNamara took the chair.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT:—Mr. Chairman, I have had some experience in this business, being interested in it for the past twenty years. This matter came up before the owners of steamers —there had been no complaints made against the food—and the majority of

shareholders agreed that there was no need of such a measure as that before us to-day. Last week when this matter came up the Hon. Mr. Grieve agreed it was not necessary. It is to the owner's interest to have good rather than inferior provisions placed on board those steamers. It is a matter of some credit that we have not heard for many years of inferior food going on board the steamers. It is hoped the Superintendent to be employed will make the crew have a picnic on several evenings of the week when there are no seals to be killed, and see that provisions made in Bill be carried out. As a shareholder, personally I think it is unnecessary to proceed with a matter like this.

HON. MR. RYAN:—I understand there are inspectors now to see if the food is a good quality. The merchant or companies who supply these ships know it is to their advantage to give the best food they can get—number one flour, number one bread and good molasses, etc. There is a great difference between conditions now and those of twenty years ago. I went to the seal fishery with the late Capt. Murphy, there was no such thing as inspection then. The food was not the same quality as it is now, but the crew ate it, there were no complaints. When they got into the seals every fellow tried to beat the best man. I do not think there is any occasion to have an inspector on board the steamer to see that sleeping quarters are kept clean, etc. We have been jiddling with Bills for the past couple of years. The more Bills that are passed the worse the fishery is getting. In my time with Mr. Murphy in the "Master," the firemen used to go out and haul seals with the crew. Now the inspector, it appears, in this Bill is to see that the sleeping quarters are kept clean, and is to report about the food. He is to be entitled to the same share of seals as any member of the crew, but he is not allowed to haul them. The men nowadays going to the ice are able to keep their places clean and the inspector can see before the ship leaves there that they are given No. 1 food. Therefore I do not think an inspector to see that quarters are kept clean is necessary.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—I have never been to the ice, but as quarantine officer it is my duty to examine ships and crews on arrival here, and on more than one occasion I had to clean up these steamers and free them from disease. I therefore have had an opportunity of studying the conditions on board. This Bill, I say, is a step in the right direction. There is no reason whatsoever why the men on board these steamers cannot live much more comfortably. One, two or three men with careless habits could disorganize the whole ship. Inspection is carried on now by the medical men on board, but if he wishes to have quarters kept in better condition he has to have a fight every morning to make the men clean up. An inspector with a legal status is what is needed. I have also had an opportunity, while inspecting the cleaning out of those ships, of seeing the quantity of food which is wasted. An inspector would prevent this waste. This will be a good thing for the ship owners and for the men themselves. The quantity of food destroyed and wasted is appalling. It would be a good thing also for the health of the men and it should make the seal fishery more attractive. It would do one good to see the quarters on the American ships—the comparison is astounding. These men live in luxury and comfort on the same expenditure of money. This is not a bill introduced by the Government to which I have the honour to belong, but I give it my support for I know it to be a step in the right direction.

HON. MR. COOK:—I agree with the remarks made by the Hon. Dr. Campbell. I have some experience with regard to the seal fishery. What we have had to clean up after voyage was over would not be nice to tell. No doubt many of those men kept their quarters clean but there are many others who would not unless complaints were made. Inspection even for that would be a good thing.

HON. MR. GIBBS.—In Section 2 of Bill I propose to make a slight amendment. The section now reads "No seals shall be killed after twentieth of April in any year." It does not say by whom. I propose that "By the crew of any sealing steamer" be added.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT:—What about sailing vessels?

HON. MR. GIBBS:—It does not apply to sailing vessels. The moving in the next section is not sufficiently clear that any of the crew violating any rule or regulation will be liable to penalty. I should suggest that after "Act" on third line be added "And in violation of any rule and regulation made by Inspector aforesaid." That will make it abundantly clear that should there be a violation of such rules or regulations by any person he should be liable to a fine not exceeding $100.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—Who is to draw up these regulations? If it is left to the inspectors on each ship there will not be uniformity and this will be a serious matter. What would be a rule on one ship would not be a rule on another. In relation to general cleanliness these would prevail all through. I would suggest these rules be drawn up by Fishery Board or Governor in Council or better still by the Public Health authorities.

HON. MR. TEMPLEMAN:—Any owner who expects his men to work without proper food is unreasonable. I thought captains were the inspectors of the crews. I would not be in favour of paying an inspector. We seem to be continually dealing with Bills on the seal fishery. Who is responsible for bringing this one in? It seems a School Boy's Bill.

HON. MR. COOK:—If this Bill is carried out it will be a benefit to the owners and compel men to keep their quarters clean. I consider this absolutely necessary after seeing conditions of steamers that have come in.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—Let us clear up the rules and regulations otherwise all the ships will have different ones. I suggest that the making of these rules and regulations be entrusted to the Public Health Department, or else we shall have one inspector enforcing his own ideas and another may pay no attention whatever to his duties.

Committee rose and reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

On motion the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act to Amend the St. John's Pilotage Act, 1917."

Hon. Mr. Anderson in the chair.

HON. MR. SHEA:—The object of this Bill is to increase the maximum pilotage from $60.00 to $80.00, so that the larger vessels coming in will pay a larger amount than the maximum pilotage at present nam,ely, $60.00. The maximum under this Bill is $80.00.

On motion the Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment. It was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

In moving the second reading of the Bill entitled "An Act Respecting the Maintenance of Certain Public Roads" the HON. MR. GIBBS said:—Mr. President, honourable gentlemen know that for some time past a discussion has been going on in the Press as to whether power should be given certain private persons for the purpose of making expenditures upon public roads for the purpose of improving them and

utilizing certain taxes which members of the Motor Association voluntarily placed upon themselves. This Bill only covers a certain section of Newfoundland, that section which is accessible by road from St. John's. The object of the Bill is a good one. In all the world over to-day Motor Associations are becoming the pioneers in good road-making and good roads are as essential to the proper development of a country as any other public facility, as a railroad or anything else of that character. If you have good public roads, properly constructed and properly maintained and extending throughout the country, greater development can take place. One of the difficulties in life in this country in many sections is isolation. You have a railroad extending from one part of the country to another, but the railroad is only good as a means of transportation for passengers and freight from certain sections. The man living fifteen miles from his neighbour is just as inaccessible as if he were living one hundred miles away. Now if we can cultivate the idea in the people of this country that good roads are necessary and essential to the proper development of the country, we are accomplishing a great deal. And this Bill is just one step in that direction. The members of the Motor Association have made up their minds to tax themselves voluntarily in order to aid themselves i nthe making of good roads. At the present time as regards the roads outside the municipal limits of St. John's, there is no means of making a proper road. There is no road making machinery, and until you get the implements necessary to make good roads you are not going to have good roads. The gentlemen who are going to administer a great portion of the taxes have as one of their objects the purchase of road-making machinery to make good roads. It is a splendid idea and I feel assured it is one which commends itself to the honourable gentlemen in the House. I beg to move the second reading.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—Mr. President, I rise with a great deal of pleasure to support the second reading of this Bill, and I think it is a step in the right direction. If all the money that has been appropriated in the last twenty years for roads had been faithfully expended in the making of highways, the country would be in a very much better condition than it is. The primary object of the Bill, as I understand it, is to have roads well made for the money that is to be spent, good value for value received. In all countries after the war vast sums of money have been spent in the improvement of the highways. The Motor Association are going to tax themselves to do this work, and in doing so I hope they will extend the roads so that we will be able to go all over the country in cars. I notice sub-section (c) of Section 2 says "In the District of Placentia, the road from Holyrood by way of Salmon and Colinet to Placentia." Now there is what is called the Old Placentia Road. I went over about five miles of that road a little over a week ago and it is in very, very good condition, taking into consideration the fact that very little has been done on that road for a number of years. This Bill is very good because we never know but the motorcar may become some day supplemental to the railroad, between St. John's and Harbor Grace or St. John's and Brigus, or in the case of a strike as happened in the Old Country some time ago, the utilization of motor cars may be of very great value. I think, Mr. President, that the Motor Association by taking a step o fthis kind is doing good for the country, by opening up roads, whether in the city limits or outside of them. The second reading of this Bill has my hearty sup-

port, and I hope that the people of the country generally, as well as those who use motor cars, will get much benefit from it.

The Bill was then read a second time aid ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

In moving the second reading of the Bill "An Act to Provide for the Observance of Commemoration Day" HON. MR. SHEA said:—I beg to move the second reading of this Bill, the object of which is merely to set aside a day in the year as Commemoration Day of the deeds and sacrifices of those men and women of Newfoundland who took an active part in the late war.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—Mr. President, I would like briefly to refer to this Bill. I was in London shortly after the first of July, 1916, when those who were wounded were being brought to various hospitals in London, and I shall never forget many of the sights in the hospitals there. I think the idea of fixing the first Sunday in July as Commemoration Day is an excellent one. During July and August of 1916 I visited many of these young men in the various hospitals, and I am very glad, indeed, Mr. President, that the Government has seen fit to perpetuate the memory of that sad occasion.

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

In moving the second reading of the Bill "An Act Respecting Local Affairs in Outport District" HON. MR. GIBBS said:—Mr. President, in moving the second reading of this Bill I desire to point out to the House that the Bill aims at giving further powers and greater control to representative bodies elected by the people in the different parts of the country. Honourable gentlemen are aware that until a few years ago the expenditure and control of public moneys were vested in Road Boards nominated by the Governor in Council. The country had outgrown that system, and it became necessary to place more and greater responsibilities in the hands of the people, and a few years ago an Act was passed respecting Local Affairs in Outport District in which the control and expenditure of road moneys were vested in public bodies elected by the people i ncertain sections. If the electors of any section of the country wish to avail of the Local Affairs Act as it now stands they simply petition the Governor in Council to have an area declared an dan election held within that area. Under the Act as it stands the election must be presided over by a Stipendiary Magistrate, Justice of the Peace, Chairman of a Road Board, or some person appointed by them. In the sections of the country where the provosions of the Act have been availed of, it has been found to work satisfactorily. In other words, greater returns for the public moneys placed in the hands of those elective boards have been given ,and this Bill is to confer still greater powers upon elective bodies of that character, so that they may have not alone the expenditure of road moneys but also expenditure of moneys upon marine works. The expenditure of moneys upon marine works has been in the hands of the elected representatives of the district, and honourable gentlemen know very well how hard it is to resist applications that are made upon the representatives of districts from individuals for small grants to do certain work, and the curse of the system is that those small grants have practically absorbed the greater portion of public moneys which were voted to do certain work and very little return was given for the money expended. This Bill then is an amendment upon the

previous Act and provides machinery for the carrying out of it where the other Act did not, and it vests the control of all public moneys in the hands of those who are elected by the people to expend that money, so that each and every elector will be interested in the proper expenditure of public moneys as the persons who will have charge of the expenditure will be elected by the votes of the people in the area that will be set out and defined, and the marine works as well will be placed in their hands, so that we will not in the future have the spectacle that has been exhibited in the past or tens of thousands of dollars being placed in the hands of private individuals and very little return given for it. I beg to move the second reading of this Bill.

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

HON. MR. SHEA in moving the second reading of Bill "An Act to Amend 'The Society for Protection of Animals Act 1914,'" said:—Mr. President, the object of this Bill is simply to prevent the owner of any animal who has been convicted under this Act and whose animal has been confiscated and sold from being in a position to purchase that animal again indirectly or directly. I beg to move its second reading.

The Bill was then read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Comtee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

HON. THE PRESIDENT announced that he had received messages from the House of Assembly that they had passed the Bill "An Act to Amend Cap. XV of 9-10 Geo. V, entitled 'An Act Respecting Elections in the Present Year,'" and requested the concurrence of the Council therein.

The House then adjourned.

FRIDAY, June 18th, 1920.

Pursuant to adjournment the House opened at 4 p.m.

On motion of HON. MR. SHEA the House uanimously consented to the second reading of Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Elections in the Present Year."

HON. MR. SHEA:—This Act, Mr. President, has to do with the elections of the present year. The first four sections deal with the voting privileges given to Volunteers in this year's elections. Section 5 states that list of voters now being made shall be list used during this year's election. I beg to move the second reading.

On motion of HON. MR .SHEA the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on this Bill with the unanimous consent of members.

Hon. Mr. Anderson took the chair.

Committee rose and reported it had passed same without amendment.

On motion of HON. MR. SHEA the Bill was then read a third time.

A message was then ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly to the effect that this House had passed the same without amendment.

On motion of HON. MR. SHEA the Bills entitled "An Act Respecting Licenses to Cut Hard Wood" and An Act to Amend St. John's Pilotage Act 1917 were read a third time, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the House of Assembly to the effect that this House had passed same without amendment.

On motion of HON. MR. SHEA the Bills entitled "Of the Prosecution of the Seal Fishery" and "An Act Respecting the Maintenance of Certain Public Roads" were deferred.

House then went into Committee on Bill entitled "An Act to Provide for the Observance of Commemoration Day."

Hon. Mr. Milley took the chair.

Committee rose and reported it had passed this Bill without amendment.

On motion of HON. MR. SHEA Committee on Bill "An Act Respecting Local Affairs in Outport Districts" was deferred.

House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act to Amend Chapter 108 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Protection of Animals." Hon. Mr. Cook in the chair.

HON. MR. SHEA:—The purport of this Bill is to prevent any person from repurchasing an animal which he has been convicted before the courts of ill-treating and which has been confiscated and sold. This Bill is to prevent him from again buying the animal, either directly or indirectly.

Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment.

On motion House adjourned until 3.30 p.m. on Saturday, June 19th, 1920.

MONDAY, June 21st, 1920.

The House opened at 4.30 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

House went into Committee on the Seal Fishery Bill.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—Mr. Chairman, I would move this Bill be adopted as read. It has been amended to meet many of opinions expressed when this Bill was before us on Friday. Provision has been made whereby the Public Health Officer will make the rules and regulations prescribed by the Act, and not the Inspector as formerly.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—Why not, Mr. Chairman, have this Bill printed? I cannot say that I approve of it as it is at present. Take for instance the question of ventilation. If this Act is not carried out who is to be prosecuted? The owner or the men. When ships leave St. John's at the present time they are equipped with an elaborate ventilation system. One of the first acts of the men when they get out is to plug up these and so stop the draught!

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES:—Mr. Chairman, I believe this Bill ought to be entirely re-constructed. The inspectors in the past were the medical men. They used to inspect the quarters not once but 3 and 4 times per day. Iknow whereof I speak for when I was port medical officer, upon arrival of these ships I examined the diaries of each medical officer and found that such was the case. I would suggest that these powers be vested in that medical officer. At the present time these medical men do good work but have no absolute power. They are dependent more upon moral suasion than they should be in their position.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Mr. Chairman, why not make the Bill as suggested by Hon. Dr. Campbell. The present officials seem to have no power.

HON. MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND MINES:—This whole Bill is a bungle, and should be entirely re-constructed. The doctors on these ships know their business, and they should have more to do in connection with a matter which is directly in their line as is this.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—I object to any man other than the medical officer having control. He is there and has the knowledge, and so is the man for this work. I think the proper thing to do would be to rise the Committee and send this Bill to a Select Committee where this and other matters will be looked into.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—I have no objections, Mr. Chairman, to the motion that a Select Committee be asked to consider this Bill.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill recommended to a Select Committee.

Committee on Public Roads Main-

tenance Bill. Hon. Mr. Milley in the chair.

HON. MR. MURPHY:—I would suggest that another clause be added to this Bill in connection with these wooden culverts. I have no doubt do everything they can, but as the time whatever but that this Committee will passes it may be left to the Road Boards and that will mean a continuance of past customs. To keep wooden culverts in repair at present cost of material and labor is far more expensive than it would be to use concrete culverts or iron pipe. You can make them with the material right on the spot and I would suggest that all small bridges up to say five foot span where required to be renewed should be replaced by concrete or iron pipe. They can be made very much cheaper than wood and would be there for always. If the parties in charge are inclined to do that then there will not be any harm in putting it in the Bill; it will provide for that being carried out. Some years ago I saw Mr. Charles Henderson up at Reid's and he told me after they had made a mold each culvert cost $1.50, three feet long. Supposing it cost $2 to-day that would be cheaper than lumber. I believe even cast iron pipe to-day would be cheaper than wood, and I know it is the cheapest and best thing we can put down. If the new road board do not handle it that way they will be making the same mistake we have always made, but if the Bill requires them to do it they will be saved further expense in the future.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—Suppose we proceed further with the Bill and consider further whether we can put that in because I question whether we can as this is not a contract we are considering. The parties concerned have just as much interest in doing the work right as the hon. gentleman and if they find that concrete is better I am sure they will have that done. I know you will find iron pipe on some of the roads and that as rapidly as possible wooden culverts will be replaced by concrete or iron. This Bill is an inovation and in order that good and proper work will be done the Motor Association and gentlemen interested want to have control of the work and see that the work is well done. The suggestion is a good one.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—I quite agree with Hon. Mr. Murphy for two reasons; first of all the culverts made of cement or iron are the most serviceable as they can be buried under ground, and secondly they are cheaper and better in every way. And another reason is that politicians will not be able to dig them up at election times. Last fall there was not a culvert or bridge in the district of St. John's West that was not destroyed or dug up; some of them perfectly good. Clear of that I think it is more up to date to build them of concrete or iron pipe as they do in Canada and the United States.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—As to whether this clause can be put in I do not know at present, but as to whether it is better to have them I do not think anybody can dispute. Of course we can conceive of cases where it may be impossible to do this but where it is possible to introduce concrete or iron pipe I think unquestionably it ought to be done. I saw some examples of that in Ferryland district when the railway there was being built; they put in concrete or iron pipe and the same policy was adopted by Sir Michael Cashin in regard to the main lines very largely and with success. Before we pass this I would like to ask the hon. gentleman in charge of the Bill whether it is intended to spend these moneys on the Colinet Road. I know it is in bad condition but whether we should use the moneys of the Colony on that road to the detriment of more used roads is to

me questionable. I think we should get a special grant for it. In the old days it was a famous road and people used to drive to Placentia over it, but the coming of the railroad killed it and it has not been much used since. It can only be used for a limited purpose and I suggest that its needs should be met by a special grant of the legislature.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—The outports are getting motor trucks. I used a motor truck to bring a load of men to the woods when fighting the forest fires. The one we had belonged to Holyrood.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—According to this an arbitrary sum is to be paid back to the Municipal Council.

HON. SIR P. T .McGRATH:—The Municipal Council is entitled to have the motor licenses. The Council wants to get the money to spend it on the city roads. This scheme was devised by enthusiastic gentlemen—Mr. Ayre and Mr. Collishaw—who on behalf of the Motor Association are prepared to pay the costs. St. John's will get five thousand five hundred dollars, plus the fees on motor trucks.

The Committee rose and reported it had made some progress and asked leave to sit again.

On motion of HON. MR. GIBBS the Committee on Bill entitled "An Act Respecting Local Affairs in Outport Districts" was deferred.

The following Bills were read a first time:—"An Act to Confirm a Contract on the Subject of the Manufacture of Paper Puly and Wood Products" and "An Act to Amend Chapter 127 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled 'Of Companies.'"

House then adjourned until Friday 4 o'clock.

FRIDAY, June 25th, 1920.

House met at 4 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

House went into Committee on the Maintenance of Public Roads Bill. Hon. Mr. Milley in the chair.

HON. MR. MURPHY:—This is not intended for large bridges. My proposal is only for small culverts up to a span of five feet. I contend you can supply cement or pipe cheaper than wood to-day. Then we can perhaps get the pipe cast here and make them in several lengths. They cast five bars, &c., and could do this also. As regards bringing undue hardship on the present Committee taking charge I do not see that. They have to replace those bridges and it would be better to do it in the best and cheapest way as I have suggested. It only compels them to do it instead of the way it is now. At present it is looked upon as a little perquinte for the political heelers who want to make a few dollars on a few old Harrigans. That sort of thing has been going on too long. However if it is the intention of hon. members here to let it go on that way, I am satisfied.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—I rise to support the suggestion of Hon. Mr. Murphy. When this Bill was up last sitting I knew little about it, but I have made some inquiries. If carried out this Bill will be the first time in the history of road making in this country that an effort was made to carry it out in a substantial manner. And Hon. Mr. Murphy's suggestion providing for concrete or iron culverts instead of wooden is a question in economy. Last year, 1919, the tax amounted in round figures to $10,600. Out of that sum, half, that is, $5,300 is paid the Government. It is estimated that with the increase of motors the revenue will be $12,000. The motor car subscriptions or taxes for 1920 will double that amount, making a gross revenue of $24,000. They will contribute $7,000 to the Municipal Council, making a balance of $17,000. Then the Govern-

ment proposes to give an amount not exceeding $10,000. Add this to the $17,000 and we find it makes a total of $27,000. The Motor Association is going to import, at its own cost,—trucks for spreading broken stones, gravel, etc., the cost of which is estimated at $20,000. Take that from $27,000 and we find a balance of $7,000 is left to make roads with, this coming season, with a further offer from the members of the Automobile Association,—the contribution of private individuals,—of $13,000 in round figures which will give a capital of $20,000. Half of this amount is to be used in improving the main roads of outlying districts and half is to be used here.

Ido not imagine it is the intention to superintend this work by going to the various parts of the country. The point I wish to make is this: This work is to be performed outside the city limits, and consequently not the work of the Municipal Council, why not supplement the various road grants where the roads are to be improved, or why should the machinery necessary for road-making be provided by the Government? The members of the Association have been very liberal in volunteering to tax themselves and I hope the Government will see its way clear to provide the money for repair costs and other necessaries regarding machinery to improve these roads. I hope before the end of 1920 to see great improvements both East and West. With reference to the suggestion of the Hon. Mr. Murphy re iron or concrete culverts, I believe this to be the intention of this Committee. I support the idea embodied in this Bill and I wish it every success.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—The suggestion made by the hon. gentleman, was spoken of the first day the Bill was in Committee. No doubt it is desirable, and every one wishes to see it carried out in work of that kind, but the hon. gentleman must know that this is not a contract between a public body and a government, to perform a certain work for a certain sum of money. If it were this kind of Bill we could draw up a specification of kind of work to be done and the amount of money to be paid for same. But this is not a Bill of that character. We cannot impose an obligation on a body of men except we give them sufficient funds to carry out the obligation imposed on them. The power of this body is limited. If we do impose obligations and duties of this character upon them, we force them possibly to over expend. If they then do not fulfil these obligations they are indicted, even if they have not the funds wherewith to carry the obligations out. This is a public body, without salary, without commission, we cannot, looking at it from a legal standpoint, impose any obligation upon htem. The hon. gentleman in his argument points out that this work will be in the hands of the Road Boards, and that the work will continue to be done in the same way as it has been done in the past, and that there will be little or no change. If he reads the Bill he will see that with the funds at their disposal this Committee shall exercise and perform similar duties to those which are by law vested in or discharged by the Road Boards but not a dollar of their money can be expended by Road Boards. The object aimed at is good roads and they cannot be made unless suggestion mentioned be carried out. Costly machinery will be used by them and as soon as the wooden bridges fall into disrepair they will be supplanted by iron and concrete ones. It is to their advantage and it is also the aim of this Bill to have better roads in certain sections of this country than there have been in the past. This Bill then as I have pointed out is not a contract or a corporation to perform certain things for certain sums of

money. If we make an agreement of this kind we can impose obligations and make specifications, etc. It is a Bill by which the Government calls into existence a public body to do certain public work for which it is not paid a dollar. This public body is in the same position as Road Board as far as duties are concerned. The Road Board is not bound to keep bridges in repair. There is no contract to this effect. The Road Board may have a certain amount of money this year and it may not have a sufficient amount the next to keep these in repair. When the machinery, to be imported for the making of the roads, is set to work we shall have roads in the country similar to those in the city.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—An occasion may arise where it is impossible to comply with the terms of the Act. If we allow this year and next year to pass and see what these people are doing and then if they do not put the steel culverts let us in this House put an amendment, but they may do this in every case. If it is proved in their operations they persist in putting up wooden structures then it will be incumbent upon us to take measures to remedy the situation.

HON. MR. MURPHY:—As far as this goes they will not be called upon to do more than the funds at their disposal will allow, but if they have the money they are to spend it to the best advantage.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—If you put an obligation on them and they fail to fulfil it they may be indicted, even though it be due to lack of funds.

HON. MR. MURPHY:—According to that, it is a very strange law if it compels them to spend more money then they have. In the case of where a wooden bridge has given out the culverts to replace the wooden ones should be of iron or concrete.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—You have to assume they will do that. It is to their own interest to do so.

HON. MR. MURPHY:—We have seen how the money has been squandered. This after all is only your opinion.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—Pardon me. I am not giving an opinion. I just state that as a matter of law, we cannot put an obligation of this kind in this Bill.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—I agree with what Hon. Mr. Murphy has said. I think that this body of men ought not to be left to do just as they please in this matter. It is better to do a small piece of road thoroughly well than to do or try to do a great deal indifferently. The country roads are a disgrace. It is plain to everybody that iron or concrete can be used in repairs for practically the same amount of money. Why not if we are given the power to tax the motors, why should not motor holders see that they are getting something for their money. The main trouble is with the culverts. The wooden culverts smell with the rain or frost and with so many cars going over them they cannot remain long in good condition. I endorse what Hon. Mr. Murphy has said that iron or concrete be used instead of wood. If this body of men would be liable to indictment before the Supreme Court, could not a clause be inserted to avoid this. Iron or concrete should be used, a wooden culvert must be attended to every year, a half a dozen motors passing over it will damage it.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—The hon. gentleman assumes this body of men is going to put down wooden culverts again. We have no right to assume this. This is not a political body, the only axe it has to grind is the making of good roads, and we cannot have good roads with wooden culverts.

HON .MR. BROWNING:—The disposition in this country is to do a great deal of work imperfectly, to endeavour

to accomplish a lot, instead of doing a little, well

HON. MR. GIBBS:—The object of this body is to remedy that very thing. It intends to start out on a track all its own and to make reforms in road-building.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—Where then is the obligation to stating this in the Bill?

HON. MR. GIBBS:—We cannot put an obligation of this sort into this Bill. The Government is not making a contract.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—It has given them power to tax.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—We are raising the tax.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—The Legislature imposes the tax in order that better roads may be made in the future than there have been made in the past. You cannot impose obligations. Section 2 will show that.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—I think the position taken by my learned friend is the correct one. He is pleading for a principle. The other is pleading for a byelaw, saying roads should be built in such a way. If you insert a clause like this you usurp the powers of the Commission. I do not see how you can demand this anyway. It is very possible that in the interests of the Colony this Committee would put down culverts as indicated. While I would not put anything in the Bill in connection with this matter I feel that by our discussing it as we have we have given sufficient indication that we unanimously favour iron culverts. It might not be wise to insert in the Bill a proviso which would likely be a bye law.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—On the legal point raised I think none of us is competent to pass. I think it is quite possible that even a wooden bridge may improve the road. What I object to is against compelling this Commission to put down iron where less than five feet wide. I have personally seen in District of Ferryland several of these culverts, but well as they may work I do not think we would be acting wisely in making it necessary that no other kind be used. I can conceive of a case when in the interest of the country it might not be practicable to put down these, and in such a case with this proviso, nothing else could be done. I think we had rather be content with registering our desire that wherever possible these be laid. I do not think we ought to go further because conditions might arise where these would not be possible. For that reason I think we ought to hesitate.

HON. MR. MEWS:—I am not a motor owner so I think after hearing the debate I can be neutral. When this Bill first came up, it came up at the instance of the Motor Association who asked to be appointed to spend the money allocated to the roads in the best interests of motorists. But the Government did not acced to their request altogether, but appointed a Commission—three of whom represent the motor owners. The Bill is now before us, and as my hon. friend to my left has said we could go on making suggestions but I think we can safely let the matter receive the attention of the Road Commission. As the hon. member introducing the measure has said, this is not a political measure; and the idea of a good Road Commission is to see that money spent is well spent, and the Commission I suppose will be composed of men who would not need to be told whether to use iron or concrete but would use what they know to be the best.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—This is a big matter, and the Commission in charge has a lot of work ahead of it. But they have considerable money and yet I feel no authority to work outside city limits. Would it not be a good idea to work this Commission in con-

junction with those spending monies on the main lines through St. John's West, Brigus, Hr. Grace and Carbonear. Then also the Holyrood and Salmon Cove Road to Placentia. By these means the whole main line might be put into condition.

HON. MR. MURPHY:— Icannot see any objection to this clause being inserted. It would only apply to where the road was worn out and the bridge had to be replaced. There is unanimous support for the idea, so why not put i tin the Bill? There is no reason in the world why it shouldn't be there. What I ask is not that opposed by Mr. Grieve. I do not say that they shall be compelled to spend more money. If they get this done it will mean less money, and they should be compelled to do this by the Act. I have no doubt but that an intelligent commission would do this without our asking, but at the same time I would secure it. However if hon. members think differently, I will withdraw my amendment.

The Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment

The House went into Committee on Bill respecting Local Affairs in Outport Districts.

Hon. Mr. Templeman took the chair.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I notice by the Bill that if there is any objection to the first election the Minister must call a second election within ten days. I would suggest that this be amended. Surely ten days will not be sufficient?

HON. MR. GIBBS:—If this matter will stand, I will take it up with the Department.

HON. SIR P. T .McGrath:—I only raise the point and place myself on record. Take St. Barbe for instance, and ten days could not possibly be sufficient.

Committee on Bill respecting Local Affairs in Outport Districts rose and reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

On motion of HON. MR. SHEA the Companies' Amendment Act Bill was read a second time and ordered to be committed on to-morrow.

HON. MR. SHEA tabled Reports of Public Schools under Church of England and Roman Catholic Boards for the year ending December 31st, 1919.

House then adjourned until Tuesday next at 4 o'clock.

TUESDAY, June 29th, 1920.

House opened at 4 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

On motion the Bill "An Act Respecting the Maintenance of Certain Public Roads" was read a third time, passed and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message informing that body that the Council had passed the same without amendment.

On motion the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act Respecting Local Affairs in Outport Districts." Hon. Mr. Templeman in the chair.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—Mr. Chairman, when this Bill was in Committee a day or two ago Sir Patrick McGrath stated that there may be a possibility that sufficient time was not given in the section with regard to notice of the holding of an election. Since the Committee rose I had a conference with gentlemen representing outport districts and they say that they gave that matter due consideration and are of the opinion that ten days' notice is sufficient under the circumstances.

Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment. The Bill was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

On motion the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act to Amend Chapter 127 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled 'Of

Companies.'" Hon. Mr. Anderson in the chair.

HON. MR. SHEA:—Mr. Chairman, as I have already said in connection with this Bill, it is a series of minor amendments to the present Companies' Act. They are all of mild character and are of more interest to the legal profession than to the general public. I move the adoption of the first clause of the Bill.

Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment. The Bill was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

On motion of the HON. MR. SHEA the second reading of Bill "An Act to Confirm a Contract on the Subject of the Manufacture of Paper Pulp and Wood Products" was deferred.

HON. THE PRESIDENT informed the House that he had received a message from the Assembly informing him that they had passed the Bill "An Act Respecting the Appointment of a Temporary Commission for the City of St. John's and for Other Purposes" and requesting the concurrence of the Legislative Council.

HON. MR .SHEA:—Mr. President, I would ask the House to pass this Bill through its three stages to-day, for this reason that honourable gentlemen will see that the term of the present Municipal Council expires to-morrow and it is desirable that that term should be prolonged for some time. This Bill provides that the powers vested in the Council shall continue until the of the present year of 1920. The intention of the Government is, I believe, that a Bill shall be brought into the House during its present session with regard to the charter of the Municipal Council, and this is a temporary measure to take effect in the meantime. Iwould therefore move the first reading of the Bill and with the permission of the House ask that the Bill be put through its stages to-day so that it may be complete.

The Bill was thereupon read a first time and on motion was read a second time.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Shea the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on this Bill. Hon. Mr. Winter in the chair.

HON. MR. SHEA:—Mr. Chairman, I would say with regard to the first clause: The statements of estimated revenue and expenditure of the St. John's Municipal Council for the year 1919 shall be of full force and effect as if complete statements had been laid before and not disallowed by the legislature. Ia appears that there were some irregularities last year and advantage was taken of the irregularities by some people who refused to pay taxes, and it is in order to meet that that the first clause is put in.

Committee rose and reported the Bill passed without amendment.

The Bill was then read a third time, passed, and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message informing that body that the Council had passed the same without amendment.

Hon. Mr. Shea laid upon the table of the House the Sixth Annual Report of the International Grenfell Association and the Report of the General Hospital.

On motion the Council adjourned until 4 p.m. on Friday, July 2nd, 1920.

FRIDAY, July 2nd, 1920.

On motion of Hon. Dr. Campbell the Manufacture of Paper Puly and Wood Products Confirmation Bill was read a second time and ordered to be committed on to-morrow.

Hon. President read a message from the Assembly that they had passed the accompanying Bill respecting the Dominion Corporation Building Assn. Ltd., in which they requested the concurrence of the Legislative Council.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea the said Bill was then read a first time and ordered to be committed on to-morrow.

House then adjourned until Tuesday next at four o'clock.

TUESDAY, July 6th, 1920.

The House met pursuant to adjournment.

On motion of Hon. Dr. Campbell House went into Committee on the Pulp and Wood Products Contract Bill, Hon. Mr. Mews in the chair.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—This is a contract entered into by the late Government and the Terra Nova Sulphite Co. represented by C. W. Storm and others. It provides for the erection of a pulp and paper mill at Terra Nova which will utilize the timber of the Terra Nova Basin which they have received by right of purchase from Ellis, Curran, Hopkins and others. We have only amended the original agreement in one respect, in regard to water powers. Previously this valuable utility has been granted without charge, but it is now recognized as a public asset which should be charged for and we are charging at the rate of 25 cents per horse power which is the same as charged in Quebec province.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Have you any idea what the H.P. will be?

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—We will have an inspector to supervise that. They propose to have a mill to turn out 100 tons of ground or sulphite pulp per day.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—As I understand it when these companies start their dams, penstock, &c., they do it on the basis of a certain definite H. P. The Albert Reid Co. at Bishop's Falls are of 14,000 H.P. I think and have a capacity of 100 tons a day. That would give a revenue of about $3,500 a year which would be very welcome I think. What is the reason for the difference in verbiage as regards sections 10 and 11?

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—Section 10 was put in for the reason that the principals of this concern were chiefly of foreign birth and there was a suspicion there might be German money in the concern and to guard against this, the section was put in and properly so, by the late Government and we left it there. It stands alone with no reference whatever to the general working of the Bill.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Section ten is not sufficiently comprehensive. We cannot alter a schedule nor can we alter an agreement which is signed and sealed, but we can add a provision. There is a conflict of terms here which ought to be reconciled.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—This Bill passed the Lower House which is bristling with lawyers.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Lawyers are more concerned about principles and don't give much attention to details. We had an example a little while ago, when a Bill supposed to be a Money Bill ran the gauntlet of the Lower House. Let the honourable gentleman take it up with the legal members of the Government so that if it is changed it will be with the concurrence of the Government.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—What amendment would you suggest?

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I should like the language of these two sections to be brought into conformity. This is sufficiently worth while to let it stand over for another day.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—We are in the Dog Days now, and this session has been a long one, however, we shall let the Bill stand over until to-morrow.

Committee rose and reported it had made some progress and asked leave to sit again.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea the House went into Committee on Bill en-

titled "An Act to Regulate the Exportation of Codfish."

Hon. Mr. Templeman took the chair.

HON. MR. SHEA:—Mr. Chairman, the hon. members will remember that this Bill was before the House a fortnight ago and was referred to a Select Committee, which now reports in favour of the Bill with certain amendments. The House is now asked to consider the amendments.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—With reference to this Bill I should like to say, this is the famous Bill on which we had so much discussion some time ago, and as a number of suggestions for alterations were made by me, perhaps it might be as well if I explained, that in this Select Committee we agreed to make most of the changes, suggested by both sides of the House. The most important one is—"A vacancy in the Board shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment was made, and in the temporary absence, through any unavoidable cause, of a member, the Governor in Council or the licensed exporters, as the case may be, may appoint a substitute to act in his place during such absence." Provision is also made to inform codfish exporters by telegram of what is done. One amendment I personally should have liked to be put in, but this the Government did not see its way clear to do would allow an appeal to the Supreme Court on suspension of concession for codfish exportation. I am not personally interested. I merely mentioned it here the last time the Bill came up. People engaged in the fish exporting industry may have sufficient interest to keep in touch with what is being done but at present no evidence of such interest is noticable to me. Gentlemen exporting codfish may find themselves in a bad situation, as a result of indifference, for this Bill gives arbitrary power to cancel or suspend license. Any breach of the regulations no matter how unimportant, it is optional to suspend or cancel offender's license, and suspension or cancellation means he may be put to a very substantial loss. If suggestion made for amendment was carried out this would not happen. Having said this, I have done my duty. I repeat if the people interested in this industry are prepared to take this risk it is their affair. Under the Bill as it stood originally it was possible for money received to be expended from the Marine and Fisheries Department, which would be similar to the Post Master General's taking the money received from the sale of stamps and paying the salaries. I think we justified the fact that we have been able to correct this Bill so that there is better legislation. I am sorry they could not see their way clear to make an appeal allowable.

HON. MR. SHEA:—I am sorry with regard to the "appeal" that the Government could not allow it. If a man were to be suspended it might lead to confusion. A man suspended, is hanging between fire and water. We thought it would be better to see how it would work for a year. It may be considered later on. If a man on the Board broke a rule and had his license suspended and an appeal to court had been made, he would be neither one thing nor the other, and if two or three were in this condition it might be confusing. As the Bill was framed this way we thought it better to let it stand at that.

The Committee rose and reported having passed same with some amendments, and it was ordered to be read a third time on to-morrow.

Second reading of Bill re "Dominion Co-operative Housing Bill."

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—In moving the second reading of the Bill granting certain concessions to the Dominion Co-operative Asocciation

Ltd., at the outset of my observations I wish to say that I have been in the public eye for over thirty years, I have taken an active part in debates in this House and the Lower House, I have taken an interest in many bills which have been submitted for the consideration of honourable gentlemen. This bill is a simple one, composed of five sections, there are only three principle parts, embodied in it. First, we ask a concession from the Government for a grant of five per cent on the cash capital paid up. We ask for free entry of building material, that we cannot find in the country. There is also in the bill that the Government appoint one third of the directors of the Company. Mr. President, after a few years of weary effort made from time to time to try and improve the social and moral condition of the citizens of St. John's our efforts have at last been consummated by a Bill of this nature, which is before this House. Questions from time to time, during the debate on this Bill in the Lower House, were asked as to who were the members of the Dominion Co-operative Association? What capital had it? and many such questions as these. Mr. President, for the information of the country and for the information of the citizens of St. John's workingmen in particular. I propose with the consideration of the House to lay before the House a complete and comprehensive account for publication throughout the length and breadth of the country, what is the meaning of the Dominion Co-Operative Association and what is its objective.

The Association is an incorporated body under the Company's Act, and is capitalized at two million dollars which would be divided into twenty thousand shares of one hundred dollars each. This Company proposes to offer to the public ten thousand shares of one hundred dollars each, amounting to one million dollars. It is proposed to call up ten per cent of the capital each year 100,000—one hundred thousand dollars paid up yearly will be about as much as the Company will be able to handle in building operations. We are now a registered Company, and have complied with every demand under the Company's Act. The following programme is set out for the work of this great Company. We hope during the coming year to enter into large contracts for lumber all over the country.

DOMINION CO-OPERATIVE BUILDING ASSOCIATION LIMITED

Capital, $2,000,000; 20,000 shares, $100 each, $2,000,000; offered to the public 10,000 shares, $100 each, $1,000,000, in payments of 10% per annum; interest 5% on the paid up capital guaranteed by the Government.

Directors—Hon. J. D. Ryan, K.C.S.C., M.L.C., President Legislative Council; Hon. M. G. Winter, M.L.C., Hon. John Anderson, M.L.C., James Parker, Esq., Harold McPherson, Esq., Eric Bowring, Esq., James McGrath, Esq., Dr. Brehm, Lieut. Col. Bernard.

Manager—Registered Office.

Bankers—The Royal Bank of Canada.

Solicitors—Hon. M. P. Gibbs, K.C., M.L.C.

Auditors—G. N. Read Son & Watson, Chartered Accountants.

Architect—W. D. McCarter, Esq.

Capital, $2,000,000; 10,000 shares $100 each offered to the public in shares of one hundred dollars each, payable in 10 years.

		First Call 10%.	
1st year		1920	$ 100.000
2nd year		1921	100,000
3rd year		1922	100,000
4th year		1923	100,000
5th year		1924	100,000
6th year		1925	100,000
7th year		1926	100,000
8th year		1927	100,000

9th year	1928	100,000	Interest	5 %	$ 75.00
10th year	1929	100,000	Ground Rent	¾%	10.00
			Insurance	1¼%	18.75
		$1,000,000	Taxes	¾%	11.25
			Repairs	1¼%	20.00
			Management	1 %	15.00
				10%	$150.00 Rent

Six hundred houses for workingmen to be built in 10 years at a cost of one million dollars.

Estimated Cost—

250 Houses	$1500	$ 375,000	
200 "	1500	300,000	
75 "	1800	135,000	
50 "	2000	100,000	
25 "	2500	62,500	
600 "		$ 972,500	
	Surplus	27,500	
		$1,000,000	

House to cost $1500.
Ground rent $20.00 per annum.
Freehold $300.00

Interest	5 %	$ 75.00
Grount Rent 1	1/3%	20.00
Insurance	1¼%	18.75
Taxes	¾%	11.25
Repairs	1 %	15.00
Management	2/2%	10.00
	10%	$150.00 Rent

10 years surplus, $27,500.
Surplus average per year, $2,750.

It is proposed to build—

Year	Houses		
1st	60	$1500	$ 90,000
2nd	60	1500	90,000
3rd	60	1500	10,000
4th	60	1500	90,000
5th	60	1500	90,000
6th	60	1500	90,000
7th	60	1500	90,000
8th	30	1500	45,000
	450		
8th	30	1800	54,000
9th	45	1800	81,000
9th	15	2000	30,000
10th	35	2000	70,000
10th	25	2500	62,500
	150		$ 972,500
	Cr. Balance		27,500
			$1,000,000
	Cr. Balance		27,500

House to cost $1500.
Ground rent $10.00 per annum.
Freehold $150.00.

House to cost $1800.
Ground rent $20.00 per annum.
Freehold $300.00.

Interest	5 %	$ 90.00
Ground Rent 1	1/9%	20.00
Taxes	¾%	13.50
Insurance	1¼%	22.50
Repairs	1 %	18.00
Management	8/9%	16.00
	10%	$180.00 Rent

House to cost $2000.
Ground rent $20.00 per annum.
Freehold $300.00.

Interest	5 %	$100.00
Ground Rent	1 %	20.00
Taxes	¾%	15.00
Insurance	1¼%	25.00
Repairs	1 %	20.00
Management	1 %	20.00
	10%	$200.00 Rent

House to cost $2500.
Ground rent $25.00 per annum.
Freehold $375.00.

Interest	5 %	$125.00
Ground Rent	1 %	25.00

Taxes	¾%	18.75
Insurance	1¼%	31.25
Repairs	1 %	25.00
Management	1 %	25.00
	10%	$250.00 Rent

The Company has been formed to build for workingmen. These houses will be let to tenants at reasonable rentals or will be sold to tenants on easy terms of payment within a period of twenty years.

Further objects of the Company are: To remove tenants from houses which are unfit for human habitation to homes of health and comfort; to destroy all hovels within the city; to adopt a proper town planning scheme; to lay out modern streets with a perfect system of sanitation; and to rebuild certain sections of the town gradually so that workingmen can live with their families in decent and cheerful surroundings.

The proceeds of sale of houses bought by tenants will be reinvested in Government securities as a redemption fund to pay off the capital.

LAND.

Leasehold or freehold on Merrymeeting Road. After corresponding for some time with Hon. J. D. Ryan, the Company succeeded in making arrangements with that gentleman, and secured the land known as Nunnery Field, this beautiful site will take sixty houses, thirty on the front street and thirty facing a proposed new street, each house will have a frontage of 20 ft. by 27 ft. the full rearage of the land will be 100 ft., this will allow a garden for each clear of about 60 feet.

The Company has the option of an open lease, or fifteen years purchase of the freehold, houses built by the Association will be rented to workingmen, based on the lowest cost of construction, and sold to tenants at actual cost, upon easy terms of payment. It is estimated the rent will not exceed ten per cent of the cost of the house, including all charges.

Cost of land for 30 houses:

1st lot, 20 ft. frontage, 50c. per foot.... .. ..$ 10.00

15 pears purchase $10.00, freehold.... .. .. 150.00

Cost of land for 30 years:

2nd lot, 20 ft. frontage, $1.00 per foot.. .. 4 .. ..$ 20.00

15 years purchase $20, freehold.. .. .. 300.00

His Grace Archbishop Roache in giving his consent to this land, made one stipulation, that in no consideration would the ground be let for any other purpose, than for the erection of better homes for the citizens.

On behalf of the Company and the public, I take this opportunity to thank His Grace for the magnificent field placed at the disposal of the Association at a nominal rental, either on lease or freehold. Adjoining this field there are other plots of land, that will be suitable to build sixty more houses.

We hope to complete during the present year thirty houses or more if at all possible. Mr. McCarter, the architect of the Company, thoroughly competent in every way to carry out the great work, has the full confidence of tthe directors and the Company. The plans laid out for this year were entirely prepared by our architect, who was instructed to order the material for immediate operations. During the next year we hope to ask for tenders for large quantities of lumber all over the country. Ordered for immediate delivery.

110,000 ft. Mill run matched.

79,000 ft. Mill run rough.

8,000 ft. Mill run Random lengths.

14,000 ft. Mill run 2x4" Random lengths.

12,000 ft. Mill run 2x4" 14/15 lengths.

24,000 ft. Mill run 2x7" 14/15 lengths.

10,000 ft. Mill run 2x3" Random lengths.

6,00 ft. Mill run 2x3 Random lengths.

40,000 ft. 5" Dressed Can Spr. and Fir Clapboard.

3,000 ft. 7/8x5 to 8" Dressed Sort Pine.

WINDOW BOXES AND SASHES.

We append below our specification of boxes and sashes, all F.O.B. cars or schooners St. John's.

60 Mullion frames and sashes, 12 lights 8x12".

60 Mullion frames and sashes, 12 lights 7x9".

30 Single frames and sashes, 12 lights 7x9".

30 Single frames and sashes, 2 lights 16x16".

For hanging top sash of mullion windows and single.

To prime and glaze sashes of mullion windows, 8x12", 7x9"; single windows, 7x9" 16x16".

Sashes 1 3/8" Pulley styles 6 outside castings 6" sills 3" and drip to be solid.

DOORS AND JAMBS.

30 Doors 2'8"x6 '8"1¾ with sash for glass.

30 Doors 2'8"x6 '8"x1¾ with 5 cross panels.

30 front doors and jambs complete, jambs to be made from 1½ stock with bracketed drip and pillastered castings, doors to be same as above.

30 back doors and jambs complete, jambs to be made from 1½" stock with solid drip and plain castings, doors to be same as above.

210 doors 2'6"x6'6"x1½" 5 cross panels.

60 doors 2'6"x6'6"x1½" 5 cross panels.

210 doors same as above with 1x6" jambs fitted with ½x2" stops and ⅝" x4" birch thresholds.

60 doors, same as above.

SASHES, FRAMES AND DOORS.

60 Mullion frames and sashes 12 Lt. 8x12.

60 Mullion frames and sashes 12 Lt. 7x9.

30 Single frames and sashes 12 Lt. 7x9.

30 Single frames and shashes 12 Lt. 16x16

DOORS AND JAMBS.

30 Front doors and jambs 2-8x6-8x1 ¾ plain crossing with hood.

30 Back doors and jambs 2-8x6-8x1 3/8 cross panel

60 Closet doors and jambs 2-4x6-6x1 3/8 cross panel

In addition to the above we have 50,000 ft. lumber delivered.

We placed orders months ago for 200 rolls roofing, 400vBls. cement, 30 baths.

CITY ELECTRIC CAR SYSTEM.

I have interview the President of the Reid Newfoundland Co. as to the extension of the street railway; I have been promised that every consideration will be given to an improved service, that the system will be extended with the increased expansion of the city, and a promise to issue workmen's car tickets at a stated hour by special cars to carry out a programme of this kind, will of course require the co-operation of the Government and the Municipal Council.

Mr. President:—The Prime Minister in his Manifesto said of

WORKINGMEN'S HOMES

"Closely allied with the matter of public health is the housing problem. The home is the basis of our Christian civilization. I propose to assist in any economically sound proposition to make easier the erection in suitable centres of homes for the working classes. The workingman in St. John's and the outport workingman coming to St. John's cannot possibly find sufficient capital with which to purchase

homes for themselves, nor can decent dwellings be rented at a reasonable price. Many public-spirited citizens, including leading employers of labor, have already interested themselves in the housing problem. This is a problem which has been faced in other countries and worked out with much satisfaction.

"I propose that this matter shall be dealt with by the Government in co-operation with the public spirited citizens and employers of labor who are prepared to invest private funds for the public benefit in this important program for the betterment of the working classes, so that the present housing conditions, which tend to the degradation and suffering and not to the uplift and comfort of this large and important section of our country's life may be put upon a satisfactory basis. No man compelled to live under the squalid conditions in which many of our best workmen are forced to live because of present conditions has a reasonable chance to rise to a high standard of independent, honourable citizenship and bring up children who will themselves make good citizens. The marvel is that our citizens have done so well, under existing circumstances. The first duty of a Government to its working classes and of capital to its labor is to look after the home conditions of the workmen and to help to improve these conditions in any manner and under any arrangement which can stand the test of sound economic principles and the good sense of the community generally."

Mr. President:--Through this House, I wish to inform the country, and the citizens of St. John's, workingmen in particular, that every concession asked for by the deputation, Hon. M. P. Gibbs, Mr. James McGrath and myself were acceded to without reservations of any kind, we put a business proposition before the Prime Minister and his Government, we asked for a guarantee of 5% and free entry for such articles not produced in the country. The bill now before the House is the best evidence of the Government's good faith to carry it out.

AN ACT RESPECTING THE DOMINION CO-OPERATIVE BUILDING ASSOCIATION, LIMITED.

1. The Minister of Finance and Cuctoms hereby authorised, subject to the provisions hereinafter contained, to pay tto the Company, out of the public funds of the Colony for and during the term of twenty years from the 1st day of January, A.D. 1920, any sum by which the net earnings of the Company shall be less than five per centum upon so much of the capital of the Company as shall be actually paid up in cash and engaged in and about the building of dwelling-houses in this Colony.

2. No payment shall be made under the preceding section except upon the certificate of the Auditor General of Newfoundland. In order to obtain such certificate the Company shall furnish to the Minister of Finance and Customs at the end of each year, during the said term of twenty years, a full and correct statement of the receipts and expenditure of the Company for the preceding year, and shall afford all proper facilities to the Auditor General to make a complete examination of the books, accounts and vouchers of the Company, in conjunction with an Auditor to be appointed by the Company. In the event of any dispute arising between the two Auditors in relation to the said statement, the same shall be referred to the determination of a public chartered accountant as umpire, to be appointed by the two Auditors. The award of such umpire shall be final and conclusive.

3. All construction and building materials and machinery imported into this Colony by the Company for use in its said business, which are of a kind

and description not manufactured in this Colony, shall for a period of twenty years from the first of January, A.D. 1920, be admitted free of duty.

4. One third in number of the directors of the Company from time to time during the said term of twenty years shall be nominated by the Government; and if by default or neglect of the Company the number of directors so nominated shall be permitted at any time to fall below that proportion, the amount guaranteed under section one shall be liable to be forfeited at the option of the Government.

5. This Act may be cited as "The Dominion Co-Operative Building Association Act, 1920."

The Importation of articles duty free are for workingmen's houses and are not to exceed a cost of $2500.00.

Mr. President:—In the month of January last the memorandum and articles of Association of the Dominion Co.Operative Building Association, Limited, were prepared by the solicitor, Hon. M. P. Gibbs, K.C., and on January 5th, 1920, was registered as a Company with the names of thirty shareholders representing about forty thousand dollars capital.

The following gentlemen have consented to become shareholders of the Dominion Co-Operative Building Association, Ltd.:

His Grace Archbishop Roache, The Lord Bishop of Newfoundland, Rev. Dr. Curtis, M.A., D.D., M.B.E., Rev. Dr. Jones, Rev. Gordon Dickie, M.A., Rev. Dr. Bond, Rev. E. W. Forbes, M.A., Rev. D. B. Hemmeon, B.A., Sir Edgar Bowring, Sir Joseph Outerbridge, R. R. Goodridge, Esq., Fred. Hayword, Esq., Hon. Judge Morris, Thomas A. Pippy, Esq., R. A. Job, Esq., Hon. W. B. Grieve, T. M. White, Esq., Wm. Linegar, Esq., T. H. Griffitths, Esq., W. R. Goobie, Esq., Hon. S. Bell, W. H. Hynes, Esq., John B. Orr, Esq., H. A. Anderson, Esq., John Murray Anderson, Esq., Harold Mitchell, Esq., Ernest Watson, Esq., Jas. Power, Esq., Llewellyn White, Esq., William Graham, Esq., W. J. Edgar, Esq., J. E. Taylor, Esq., Hon. W. C. Job, John Withers, Esq., A. J. Harvey, Esq., A. MacPherson, Esq., Hon. S. Milley, William White, Esq., Brian Dunfield, Esq., Capt. Campbell, Joseph Fitzgibbon, Esq., H. E. Cowan, Esq., Andrew Carnell, Esq., William A. McKay, Esq., Geo. Carter, Esq., Hon. F. McNamara, Jesse Whiteway, Esq., Hon. R. K. Bishop, T. A. McNab, Esq., R. A. Templeton, Esq., J. M. Devine, Esq., W. P. Shortall, Esq., F. B. Wood, Esq., A. McNamara, Esq., J. M. Spearns, Esq., C. J. Ellis, Esq., Hon. Tasker Cook, H. D. Reid, Esq., Rev. Dr. Green, Wm. R. Howley, Esq., K.C., Chas. H. Hutchings, Esq., O.B.E., Inspector General of Police, Denis Galway, Esq., Thos. Fitzgibbon, Esq., D. M. Baird, Esq., Hon. Philip Templeman, Robert Saunders, Esq., Fred. Emerson, Esq., Philip Hanley, Esq., C. F. Bond, Esq., Samuel Ryall, Esq., Michael Stafford, Esq., J. J. Mulcahey, Esq., John Barron, Esy., S. O. Steele, Esq., Jas. T. Phillips, Esq., Charles Pippy, Esq., C. L. March, Esq., J. B. Mitchell, Esq., A. Carnell, Esy., Walter Collymore, Esq., P. H. Cowan, Esq., C. R. Steer, Esq., T. H. Steer, Esq., John G. Steer, Esq., Matthew Prim, Esq., Lloyd Woods, Esq., Joseph Perez, Esq., P. L. Kent, Esq., William Larner, Esq., Robert Searle, Esq., A. J. Frost, Esq.

In addition to the above names of citizens, and numerous others, we have the support of every Union of Labor and Labor Organization in the city.

COUNCIL'S REPORT ON HOUSING

During the year, 109 permits for dwelling houses were issued, of which fifty-one are completed, thirty-two are under construction, and twenty-six not yet begun. This is a refreshing change from the stagnation in building which we have had during the past four years,

and allows one to hope that conditions financial and practical will permit people to provide themselves with houses which will not be a menace to the health of the city. In regard to this it must be mentioned that the determination of the Council not to allow any house to be erected which could not be provided with proper sewerage, has been vindicated in the Courts.

The Council, after several years' effort, was at length enabled to carry out its scheme of building houses for those who were unable, either from lack of sufficient capital or other reasons, to do so for themselves. It was late before a beginning could be made, and it was deemed advisable not to embark immediately upon an extensive programme. Arrangements were therefore made for twenty houses, but twelve only were actually begun and are now nearing completion. The cost of these six-roomed, semi-detached houses is about $2,000.00, which seems high compared to pre-war prices, but the Council is confident they are cheap at the price to-day. These houses are not for rent but for sale, on terms of deferred payment, with an initial payment of, at least, $500.00. No great rush was evidenced to buy them, but all have been practically engaged and four are already occupied.

The houses are built upon Crown lands on Quidi Vidi Road. The site is an excellent one, and when streets are opened and water and sewerage mains laid will accommodate altogether thirty to forty houses.

The Council has in contemplation taking over certain lands in the West End of the city, for the purpose of erecting houses for workingmen. The Council proposes to continue to build houses if orders for the same are given beforehand, but will not build on the chance of selling. A modification of the plans of last year has been decided upon which will effect a saving of about $200.00, but it is feared this will be offset by increased cost of materials and labour.

The Council believes that a great deal of harm to the housing situation has been done, and can still be done, by ill-considered housing schemes promising people houses at impossible rentals. Since the days of the Cave Men it has been the object of every man to provide himself with a home, and it is certain that three quarters, at least, of all the houses built in St. John's will be provided by individual initiative and effort. It is most important that this initiative should not be abated by the action of an outside agency suggesting that houses can be provided at less than cost. Again it is important that people should own the houses they live in, thus giving them an interest in the community, and an object in keeping their houses in good repair. Provided that dwelling houses are built under proper supervision, with proper safeguards, (such as are provided in the Building Regulations contained in the Charter), it is most important that every man should own the house he occupies.

Mr. President:—I regret His Honor the Mayor and his associates in the Council should have been so much perturbed, about housing schemes, doing them an injury in carrying out their programme of building houses for sale, the last paragraph in the annual report of the Municipal Council, under the heading of Housing . I propose to deal with it, in a spirit of benevolent sympathy, and point out to the Mayor and members of the Council, that their scheme will be no solution of the housing problem, and that the ordinary workingman will never be able to occupy these houses built by the Council under the conditions laid down that they have to buy.

I welcome any scheme either public or private that will provide decent

homes for our people. I welcome any support either public or private that will assist the Council in building houses or that the Government may support as a business proposition.

In a city like St. John's, outside of private enterprise, which is very limited in building work men's houses, there is only room for one company to grapple with the situation of a housing scheme, wide in its scope, to tackle hundreds of houses, as the Prime Minister has wisely said, let us clean up the town of all slum houses and hovels, and give the workinman a decent home to live in, at the outset of our campaign for improved conditions we asked the co-operation of the Government, Municipal Council, and the people, if this had been done four years ago to-day we would have had not less than four hundred new houses to our credit. What is the scheme of the City Council?

SCHEDULE A OF THE CHARTER.

Form of agreement for the erection and sale of working class dwellings:

The following agreement has been concluded between the City of St. John's, and James Smith, hereinafter called the Lessee.

THE CITY AGREES to lease to the Lessee the lot indicated on the annexed plan consisting of 20 ft. of frontage on Royal Street, at the rate of 50c. per foot of frontage for the term of ninety-nine years, the Lessee to have the privilege of purchasing the freehold of the said lot at any time during the currency of the lease by the payment of a sum equal to twenty years rental $200.00.

THE CITY AGREES to build a dwelling house according to the plan and specification submitted herewith on the land so leased for the sum of $2000.00, and the Lessee agrees to repay to the City one-fourth of the cost of the said house upon the completion of the same, and the balance of the amount together with interest at 6% in equal quarterly (annual) payments for a term of 10 years, and also fire insurance upon the whole amount until the same shall have been repaid to the Council.

AND THE LESSEE shall give to the City of St. John's a first mortgage on the house so built for such amounts as may remain unpaid.

AND THE LESSEE shall maintain the house so erected in good condition and shall promptly and without objection make all necessary repairs, and other works which may be deemed necessary to the proper unkeep of the same, in accordance with the orders of the Council, to whose supervision the Lessee shall be subject.

THE CITY SHALL have the right to repurchase the said house at a valuation to be settled by arbitration as provided in this Act:

(a) Whenever the Lessee, his executors or administrators, shall have. been in arrears with one of the stipulated payments for a period of six months or more.
(b) In case and as often as the Lessee, his executors and administrators desire to let the said house at a rate in excess of the amount fixed by the Council.
(c) In case and as often as the Lessee, his executors, administrators or assignees desire to sell the said house during the term arranged for payment of the cost of the same.
(d) If the Lessee fails to inhabit the house himself in spite of being notified to do so.
(e) If the Lessee fails to keep the house in good repair as above provided.
(f) If distraint is proposed in respect t othe said property.

Take a house built by the City Council to cost $2000, and follow the

payments for ten (10) years, if in twenty (20) years half these amounts.

House to Cost	$2000.00
By Cash 25%	500.00
	$1500.00

By ten (10) yearly payments

$150.00	$1500.00
1st year's payment	$ 150.00
Interest 6%	90.00
	$240.00

Payable Quarterly $60 every month. In addition the tenants has to pay—

Fire Insurance 1¼% $2000	25.00
Estimated Ground Rent	10.00
City Taxes	15.00
Repairs 1%	20.00
	$ 310.00
Annual Charges	$ 70.00
2nd Years Payment	$ 150.00
Interest	81.00
	$ 231.00
Annual Charges	$ 70.00
	$ 301.00
3rd Years Payment	$ 150.00
Interest	72.00
Annual Charges	$ 70.00
	$ 292.00
4th Years Payment	$ 150.00
Interest	63.00
Annual Charges	$ 70.00
	$ 283.00
5th Years Payment	$ 150.00
Interest	54.00
Annual Charges	$ 70.00
	$ 274.00
6th Years Payment	$ 150.00
Interest	45.00
Annual Charges	$ 70.00
	$ 265.00
7th Years Payment	$ 150.00
Interest	36.00
Annual Charges	$ 70.00
	$ 256.00
8th Years Payment	$ 150.00
Interest	27.00
Annual Charges	$ 70.00
	$ 247.00
9th Years Payment	$ 150.00
Interest	18.00
Annual Charges	$ 70.00
	$238.00
10th Years Payment	$ 150.00
Interest	9.00
Annual Charges	70.00
	$ 229.00
Cost of House	$2000.00

Total Cost of House in ten (10) years:

By Cash on Cost	$ 500.00
10 Yearly Payments $150	1500.00
Interest	495.00
Ground Rent Freehold	200.00
	$2695.00

Estimated Annual Cost of Municipal Council Houses for Workingmen:

First Payment in Cash	$ 500.00

Instalment and Charges:

1st year	$ 310.00

2nd	"	301.00	charges of $80.00.
3rd	"	292.00	
4th	"	283.00	
5th	"	274.00	
6th	"	265.00	
7th	"	256.00	
8th	"	247.00	
9th	"	238.00	
10th	"	229.00	

I understand the twelve houses built by the Council are erected on Crown land for which was paid a nominal price, and that the buyers of these houses will have to pay a perpetual ground rent of $20.00 per annum. Now Mr. President, let us take another case of these houses built by the Council, for sale and not to rent. How many workingmen in St. John's are in a position to carry out the Council's instructions as laid down in Schedule A of the Charter. Take the $2000 house to be paid for during the period of five years:

House to cost	$2000.00
By Cash 25%	500.00
To balance	$1500.00
By five (5) yearly payments, $300	$1500.00
1st yearly payment	$ 300.00
Interest 6¼	90.00
	$ 390.00
Payment quarterly, $97.50, every three months. In addition the tenant has to pay:	
Fire Insurance 1¼%—$2000.	$ 25.00
Estimated Ground Rent	20.00
City Taxes	15.00
Repairs 1%	20.00
	$ 470.00

You will note I am putting down $20 for ground rent included in the Annual charges of $80.00.

2nd Years Payment	$ 300.00
Interest 6%	72.00
Annual Charges	80.00
	$ 452.00
3rd Years Payment	$ 300.00
Interest 6%	54.00
Annual Charges	80.00
	$ 434.00
4th Years Payment	$ 300.00
Interest 6%	36.00
Annual Charges	80.00
	$ 416.00
5th Years Payment	$ 300.00
Interest 6%	18.00
Annual Charges	80.00
	$ 398.00
Cost of House to the Council	$2000.00
Total cost of House to the buyer in five yearly payments:	
By Cash on cost	$ 500.00
5 yearly payments $300	1500.00
Interest	270.00
Ground Rent Freehold value	400.00
	$2670.00

Estimated Annual Cost of Municipal Houses for Workingmen:

Fist Payment in Cash	$ 500.00
Instalment and Charges:	
1st Year	470.00
2nd "	452.00
3rd "	434.00
4th "	416.00
5th "	398.00

I have no desire Mr. President to find fault or condemn the Municipal Council in their housing programme, but to point out how impossible it will be for

the ordinary workingman to occupy these houses.

Iunderstand a Bill, an Act to amend and consolidate the Laws in relation to the Municipal affairs of the Town of St. John's will be introduced this session. This Act may be cited as The St. John's City Charter. I was one of the members who assisted in the preparation of the Charter. The original Charter itself is not unanimous. I am not aware to what extent it has been altered either by the Citizens or Parliamentary Committees. The printed copy of the Charter contains 398 sections and 301 Sub-Sections, these will certainly require to be taken up and given thoughtful and careful consideration. I will, for the information of the House, draw the attention of hon. gentlemen to housing section 225. Every building in the occupancy of the owner, hereafter erected or which has been erected within the ten years immediately preceding the passage of this act, shall be assessed for the City Tax as follows:

Every owner of any building as aforesaid shall when called upon to do so, make a declaration on oath before the Secretary, Treasurer, as to the cost of such building including therein the value of the ground if the same is freehold, the cost of all materials used, and the value of the labour incurred. On Frame Buildings the annual rental value for purposes of taxation shall not be less than 10 per cent, on cost under $2000; 8 per cent on cost from $2000 up to $5000; 8 per cent on cost from $5000 up to $10,000; 7 per cent on cost from $10,000 up.

When the Charter comes before the House, I hope to deal with this section later.

HOUSING BONDS.

Campaign Starts in the City of London Junt 7th.

The Guildhall meeting in support of the Housing Bonds scheme which had been postponed from April 12, was held on Monday, June 7th, when banking insurance, and other City interests were well represented. The Prime Minister, who had asked that the meeting should be postponed until that date owing to his attendance at the Supreme Council at San Remo, was unable to be present owing to his indisposition, and ihs place was taken by Mr. Bonar Law.

In a letter to the Lord Mayor, who presided, Mr. Lloyd George said:— "The interests of public health and humanity are at stake. Adequate housing will ensure happy homes, which are the surest guarantee any country can provide against agitation and unrest."

Mr. Bonar Law's speech was an appeal to local patriotism to make the scheme a success. He made the following points:—

If every effort was not made to improve the conditions of the people, there would be a discontented, sullen, and perhaps angry nation, which would be fatal to trade, industry, and credit.

Schemes for 180,000 houses and tenders for over 100,000 had been finally approved. Work was in progress on 30,000 houses.

Progress was being hindered for want of financial means.

He appealed to local authorities to stimulate local patriotism and feeling.

The clashing of interests between the demands of the State and the terms for local housing was more apparent than real.

The State had ceased to borrow money, and he hoped and believed that, in his lifetime at least, the State would never be a borrower again for State purposes.

A Committee had been set up to prevent localities competing with each other.

Districts unable to raise all the

money themselves, but which had done their best, would be assisted.

Every local authority with a rateable value over $500,000 should issue housing bonds.

He was not afraid of revolutionaries, but there was nothing more dangerous than continuance without effort to improve housing conditions.

Although this meeting was looked on as the official inauguration of the campaign, the scheme has been before the country for some time, and local authorities in many parts of the Kingdom have been going ahead with the work. The bonds are issued in amounts of $25.00, $100, $250, $500 and multiplies of $500. They will carry not more than 6 per cent interest, and will be repayable at par.

Mr. Bonar Law's speech on Housing Bonds at the Guildhall, London, last month may be regarded as the official opening of the Housing Bond campaign throughout the country, although local authorities in many parts have already been hard at work familiarising the general public with the scheme.

Mr. Bonar Law, in the course of his speech, declared that the appeal which was being made for bonds for the State was not new borrowing. The money the Treasury was asking for was at the rate of five per cent, to be varied according to the Bank rate. The Housing Bonds were at a fixed rate of six per cent.

"Under the scheme as arranged at present," said Mr. Bonar Law, "local authorities with a rateable value above $1,000,000 wer to raise the whole of the money. The Government recognised that there were some districts which could not raise all the money themselves, but they must try.

"They thought that every local authority with a rateable value of $500,000 upwards should start an issue of Housing Bonds. Already 260 out of between 400 and 500 such authorities had done so, and he believed others would follow suit."

Among the many Housing Companies of Great Britain, The Alliance Housing Association, London, of which Lord Holdon is President, has arranged for the erection of 1000 houses and bungalows for $3000.00 each in Southend, Westcliff, and Leigh, wherever suitable plots can be obtained. As many as possible will be made ready for occupation by September, they will be allotted by ballot.

Mr. President:—Although during the past four years I have, in the press and from the floor of this House, advocated that an effort should be made to improve our housing conditions, no attention was paid to my cry, a deaf ear and personal abuse from some quarters were my reward and those associated with me. In a small country like Newfoundland we cannot expect the great things of wealthier nations, but in a small way we can make a beginning. I am much interested in every change and move of the housing problem in the Mother Country. The latest Saving Certificates and housing, a new Alliance.

In the House of Commons on Wednesday, June 23rd, in reply to a question, the Chancellor of the Exchequer said:—"On the urgent representations of the National Savings Committee I propose, if the House will agree to the necessary legislation, that 50 per cent of the proceeds of Savings Certificates bought after October 1 next should be made available for loans to local authorities. Arrangements are being made to work out a scheme under which each area will be able to borrow from the Local Loans Fund in proportion to the amount of its subscriptions to certificates."

Lord Islington (Chairman of the National Savings Committee) issues a statement welcoming this announcement, and adding: "During the war

the savings movement received the active assistance of local authorities. The Savings Certificate, with its absolute guarantee against depreciation of capital value, and its facility for withdrawal, is undoubtedly the best security for the small investor who will be now able to play his part in assisting his own district in raising the money so urgently needed for housing and other local purposes.

"Though its appeal to the small investor for this purpose must be deferred until October 1, my Committee is prepared to ask the local Savings Committees to render every possible assistance to local authorities from now onwards in their campaigns for the sale of housing bonds among those classes of the community for whom the bonds are a suitable investment.

"I confidently anticipate that this alliance between the savings organisations and local authorities will have beneficial and far-reaching results, both in promoting the success of the various local financial campaigns and in stimulating the interes of small investors in local finance generally.
vestors in local finance generally.

The wealth of a nation is its people. At last, if slowly, we are coming to realize that the real wealth of a nation is its people.

In the past we set up a god of material wealth ,and made human sacrifice to it; but to-day war has taught us what it seems we could not learn from peace, that healthy, happy, and therefore, efficient people cannot be born and reared amidst miserable surroundings, and that, though the cost of improving those surroundings will be great, the cost of producing a sickly and degraded people is greater.

With co-operation, thrift, and common sense, a proper business housing scheme will not only fill an urgent need, but will acceleate demobilization and reduce unemployment. If a further reason be wanted for a progressive housing policy, there is one more convincing than all others it is that, as a bare measure of justice, every man who has given of his best in working for his country should be regarded as entitled to a decent home in pleasant surroundings.

The housing situation has become serious, and the importance of dealing rapidly and effectively with the problem at once cannot be exaggerated.

Bad and inadequate housing seriously effects on both social and industrial conditions. It is one of the chief causes of the spread of disease, of infant mortality, and of physical deterioration, and also of social and industrial unrest.

As regards the plans for the construction of houses and the laying out of the land, the first duty of the Company will be to build six hundred houses for workingmen.

These houses will be rented to the working class and our artizans at a minimum rent upon the actual cost of construction.

We propose to build these houses, if at all possible in broad clean streets, bordered with substantial buildings of modern design, with plenty of space and air, houses that will be well made, well kept and well lighted, with a perfect system of drainage, and a magnificent supply of water; every home to be fitted with the most up-to-date fitting for sanitation. In time the town of St. John's should become a veritable garden city.

The evils arising from the "insanitary and insufficient accommodation" now prevailing are pretty generally recognized. Thousands of our fellow-citizens are compelled to live under conditions which are a scandal to civilization. They are housed in confined, dirty, evil-smelling lanes and streets, deprived of fresh air and sunshine stringers to the sight of grass

and trees and flowers, and without opportunity for healthy recreation.

All this inevitably tends to produce moral and physical deterioration. It is almost impossible for people to maintain a high standard of character and physique where all the conditions are adverse and we have only to visit the places described in order to see how disastrous are the results. Little wonder if, while many battle bravely against their surroundings and rise superior to them, a small number succumb, and go to swell the mass of vicious, criminal and diseased humanity, which is a disgrace and menace to our city.

Here, then is the problem to be faced: Population overcrowded in houses, houses overcrowded on land; streets and houses in innumerable cases in a shamefully insanitary condition.

The type of dwelling required in ordinary circumstances is the self-contained house; occasionally there may be a demand for accommodation of a limited character, e.g., accommodation for newly married couples or for aged persons without a family, and in such cases it may be desirable to meet the demand by the provision of two storey houses, consisting of two self-contained dwellings; but, generally, it would seem desirable to avoid the erection of blocks of buildings containing a series of tenements.

A distinguished prelate of this city has said: "The housing conditions in certain sections are a disgrace to the city. This is a matter that would seem to call imperatively and immediately for united effort and action on the part of all interests and sections in the community, as well as for the assistance of the State, amongst whose most valuable assets must ever be reckoned the health and happiness of its citizens. It surely should be possible for corporate enterprise, with the active sympathy of the State, to evolve some comprehensive system whereby the housing problem could be dealt with on an extensive scale, and better homes at reasonable rentals provided for large numbers of our people in St. John's. Until this is done, despite the commendable efforts that are being made by the health authorities to bring about a decline in infantile mortalty and to combat the spred of tuberculosis, we must inevitably continue to pay our heavy toll in disease, misery and death."

Bad housing conditions affect not merely physical health, but the general standard of life. How is it possible to keep a home clean and comfortable if it consists of two rooms only, while the family number ten? How is it possible to maintain deceny when there are insufficient bedrooms to separate the sexes, or when, as is not uncommon in hundreds of houses, there is no sanitary conveniences of any kind.

In many respects the demands of the intelligent women living in a town like St. John's vary but little. They ask for a house rather than a flat, though some admit that, for the sake of reducing the cost, the two-flat house might be adopted, while most agree that, for old people, and single people, blocks of dwellings are not objectionable; but the ambition of a woman with a family is a house with a small garden in which the children can play, the washing can be dried, and in which is a shed for storage of coal and other things, for which it is difficult to find a place inside a small house.

If parents have only slum houses to bring up children, what else can we exect but a high percentage of infant mortality. What is the use of lecturing mothers on the science of motherhood if you continue to let them live in a hovel?

It is not only the children who die that we must consider, but the children

who live, halt and maimed and sickly, the boys and girls who survive the perils of childhood to grow into unhealthy undersized, miserable specimens of humanity. The wealth of a nation is its people.

The first aim will be to remove those who live in houses not fit for human habitation to homes of health and comfort.

With the end of the war comes the return to Newfoundland of our soldiers and sailors. Thousands have returned. Are we to keep them, or will they leave their native land in disgust?

They have seen other countries, other conditions and other possibilities, and they are not prepared to face the sordidness of a dull lief in a miserable and hopeless home, when they can find better conditions and equally good employment in almost every other country on earth. The time has come when something must be done to attract and keep our discharged soldiers and sailors. A good beginning can be made by providing them with fit houses to live in, and making the present city of St. John's better conditioned in other respects and worthy of the men who risked their lives for their country.

We have all read of the wonderful accounts of the sufferings which our heroes have undergone in the trenches. If we sat still now and did nothing, to let them come home from horrible water-logged trenches to some houses little better than a pigsty here, would indeed be criminal on the part of ourselves and would be a negation of all we have said during the war, that we can never repay what they have done for us.

Those who have suffered the hardships of war and the long bitterness of separation deserve of us better than to have to pass their lives in a slum. It is only by the co-operation of all that the ideal of building houses for our workers will be achieved.

WORLD'S HOUSING CONGRESS. GREAT MEETING IN LONDON.

At the Inter-Allied Housing and Town Planning Congress held at the Central Hall, Westminster, London, last month, many important and far-reaching schemes were discussed.

Delegates appointed by Governments, local authorities, and national organisations came from France (35), Spain (20), Norway (45), Sweden (40), Holland (50), Belgium (25), Finland (53), Denmark (20); other representatives were present from Australia, New Zealand, Canada, Cape Colony, Egypt, Italy, Czecho-Slovankia, America, Japan, Poland, Rumania, Siam, Switzerland, and Yugo Slavia.

One of the most important discussions was the possibility of securing the preparation and official acceptance by the Government of each country of a housing programme, to be carried into effect by the State acting in co-operation with municipal and other agencies sufficient in scope and character to secure within 20 years that every family shall be housed under proper conditions and surroundings.

Mr. President, why was Newfoundland not represented at the World's Housing Congress held in London last month. I will tell you why, every honest effort that was made to improve the housing conditions of our workingmen, soldiers and sailors during the past four years were turned down, until taken up by the present Government, every concession asked for by the Dominion Co-Operative Building Association Limited were granted. We have every assurance from the Government that they are determined to co-operate with the Company and see that the citizens of St. John's are provided with Better and healthier homes in decent surroundings.

THE KING OF IDEAL HOMES.

The King at Buckingham Palace received a deputation from the Inter-

Allied Congress on Housing and Town Planning, which has been sitting in London and inspecting housing and town-planning schemes in various parts of the country. Dr. Addison, on the delegates behalf, handed an address to the King.

"I was gratified to learn that this important Congress, to which so many nations have sent delegates, was to assemble in this country," said the King in his reply, "and I am glad that the Housing and Town Planning Council, which has been responsible for its organisations, has afforded the delegates an opportunity of visiting housing schemes which are now in progress here, so that they may see something of the work upon which we have begun.

"I have read with much interest the resolutions passed by the Congress and have been struck by their eminently practical nature. The preparation of a definite programme must surely be the first essential of comprehensive housing before in any country.

"It is particularly noteworthy that the Congress has been able to establish in some detail an ideal standard of accommodation and comfort in all the houses to be provided.

"The proper solution of the housing problem lies not merely in the provision of more and better houses and the clearance of slum areas, but in the far-sighter planning which will put on proper lines the development of our centres of population.

"The meeting of the Congress and this expression of their views is a significent demonstration of the awakened feeling which is animating the people in all countries.

"This Congress is a testimony of the realisation that the provision of improved housing is fundamental to the health, happiness, and progress of all the peoples, and the proceedings of the Congress must be a great stimulus and, of course, value to all who are grappling with the problem.

"I am glad to have the opportunity of again evincing my personal interest in this vital question."

It is well-known that in England enormous strides have been made, as in other countries, in the matter of building houses for workingmen. Already some 20,000 (?) have been erected, but as there are over 700,000 (?) required it will be several years before the shortage has been met.

The Government of Great Britain realizes as our own now does, what an important factor in the well-being and prosperity of national life good social conditions for the workingmen mean. His Majesty the King has shown his approval by repeatedly visiting centres of industry where building is in progress and by public utterances has signified his satisfaction at the way the question is being tackled.

When he was in Newfoundland last summer the Prince of Wales evinced considerable interest in the housing problem, and asked for information on the subject.

We are all aware that His Excellency the Governor is alive to the importance of our local needs, and I am sure he will be as pleased as anybody to know, in due time, that a number of houses have actually been built and that the kind act of Lady Harris in turning the first sod on our building site has been consummated in the appearance of comfortable houses for our poorer brothers.

Mr. President, it is beyond my ken to prophecy to what extent and limit this Dominion will require to borrow money for future state requirements, and what interest we will have to pay for our future loans. With so much money in the country invested at 3% there should be no difficulty in raising the necessary capital required by the Dominion Co-Operative Building As-

sociation at 5% guaranteed by the Government for twenty years.

Rates of interest on our public debt:

Loan at 3	per cent....	$1,581,666.66
Loan at 3½	per cent....	8,905,346.65
Loan at 4	per cent....	9,002,432.29
Loan at 5½	per cent....	5,000,000.00
Loan at 6½	per cent....	7,543,400.00
Loan at 5½	per cent....	1,000,000.00

The Bill under review. The Government have in no way restricted the operations, of the Company, except in one way, that is, material imported for workingmen's houses are not to exceed the cost of $2500. This section is right and proper. It may be in the interest of the Company to build a better class of house for young men in stores and other occupations, to float the balance of the capital 10,000 shares $100.00—$1,000,000.00—or it may be in the interest of the Company to make loans to persons having land of their own to build.

Loans on a carefully thought-out scheme, as to principal and interest $500,000.

Second part of the programme will be to erect a better class of house suitable for clerks, and young men who are about to get married, balance share capital $500,000.

Estimated cost—

105	Houses	$2500	$262,500.00
25	"	3000	75,000.00
20	"	3500	70,000.00
20	"	4000	80,000.00
			$487,500.00
		Surplus	12,500.00
			$500,000.00

The programme outlined by the Company is a colossal task, it means the erection of 770 houses, and the loaning of $500,000 to assist others who wish to build themselves on land of their own.

Mr. President, we can never tackle successfully a job of which we are afraid. Our effort must be equal to the task. We must handle the housing problem, we ask all classes to assist in this great work of reconstructing the city of St. John's. Politicians, politics, mixed with political mud, are not the elements to be used in the reconstruction of a city or building up a country, this is the work of a statesman who is a politician of the highest class, an architect in public life, a moulder of character, an example to the subjects of a nation, and the builder of an empire.

Mr. President, I have much pleasure in moving the second reading of a Bill, An Act Respecting The Dominion Co-Operative Building Association Lid.

HON. MR. POWER:—The Council houses are all occupied by outport men, and there is not a workingman in one of them. Now you made some reference to me some time ago and I want to say I have twenty-five tenants to-day and have not raised the rent one dollar on any of them, and I challenge you or anybody else to visit them to-day and you will find them all tenantable. It is all right for you to make charges but what do you charge for your material? You are making a dead set on an industrial man and his antecedents. What have you done. You never made any attempt to build up the town.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—I fear the hon. gentleman has misunderstood my remarks.

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

HON. PRESIDENT read a message from the Assembly that they had passed the Bill respecting the giving effect to certain treaties between His Majesty and certain other powers in which they requested concurrence.

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

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—I beg to move the first reading of Bill to amend the Patriotic Fund Act 1915. We have an Act already under which we are operating but now that the strain and stress of war are over we wish to spend the rest of the money in our possession to meet cases which are not provided for under the Pensions Act.

Said Bill was read a first time and by the unanimous consent of the House, a second time, and ordered to be committed on to-morrow.

HON. MR. SHEA gave notice of Suspension of Rules on to-morrow.

House then adjourned until Thursday at four o'clock.

THURSDAY, July 8th, 1920.

The House met pursuant to adjournment.

HON. MR. GIBBS tabled report of the Select Committee on Bill entitled "An Act to Amend Chapter 162 of the Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled 'Of the Prosecution of the Seal Fishery.'"

HON. MR. SHEA moved the third reading of Bill entitled "An Act to Regulate the Exportation of Salt Codfish."

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—Before this goes past and becomes law, I wish to make a few remarks with regard to my views in respect to this Bill. In Committee, I gave expression to my sentiments, I feel very strongly that it is a measure that will not benefit the Dominion. It is detrimental to its best interests. I rise at this stage of the Bill to object to it. We have no precedent in any country for such a course as is proposed to be adopted now and to become the law of the land. A similar thing was tried for a short period by the Norwegians but was dropped as not being workable. My feelings have been strengthened by the experience of the last six months. The placing of an arbitrary price on the produce of the country will enable our competitors to undersell us. I submit that our position has been weakened by the carrying out of this measure during the period to which I have referred. This Dominion finds itself with a considerable quantity of old codfish—last season's catch—and a considerable amount on the market deteriorated owing to the fact that we were not permitted to meet with the competition of men of other countries, who were able to dispose of their catch and produce, while we had to hold ours. Those limitations were placed upon us when 50% of last year's catch was realized. My convition is that if we applied these rules to the whole catch of the country we should find ourselves in this position that a large amount of our fish would not be marketable or we should find ourselves with a large quantity of fish going into competition with the cheaper products of other countries.

It is well-known to hon. members in business, it is common property, that France and Great Britain, the principal powers in the war are making a strong effort to get demobilized soldiers back to their pre-war situations, and every opportunity is taken to get them to return amongst other pursuits to the prosecution of the fishery, so as to increase the number engaged to the fullest extent. At the present time the three-fold increase of the British fisheries has produced such a condition of affairs that fishermen find it unprofitable to land, and are dumping the proceeds of their labour. They cannot find a market for it. This has largely to do with fresh fish. Large quantities of the common fish from the North Sea and the Irish Channel and other fishing grounds is adapted for salting. Already in England and Ireland a large portion is being salted and is going into competition with fish of this country in Italy and Portugal. Our com-

petitors in Nova Scotia have an abundant bank fishery this year. The Japanese, an energetic and thrifty people, are invading the Italian market. They are bringing fish across the Pacific by way of San Francisco and New York and placing it on markets which hitherto were ours. If we allow those people to undersell us and dispose of the whole of their catch it appears to me that when we come to realize on a normal fishery we shall find ourselves confronted with greater difficulties.

One honourable gentleman in the course of his remarks said "Give it a trial." Why should we, if it is going to injure the country. Another hon. gentleman—one unacquainted with that branch of the business for which I am pleading, said so many hon. members in the other Chamber had voted upon it he would support the measure. This is not a worthy argument. If it were upon a minor product, and in view of so many honourable gentlemen being in favour of the Bill I would withdraw my opposition, but I feel that we are tampering with legislation the consequence of which will be very serious. I am foreseeing a few months hence when the large bulk of the labour of the people is placed upon the market—I foresee a deadlock. We should all like to see the whole produce realized.

I feel that if I am to be refused to clear my vessels at the Custom House and if the sale of my produce is to be relegated to a channel to which I have no connection, and if I am to be told the price at which to sell this article I do not see, with the liberty of the subject taken away, what the end will be. It will create a feeling of want of confidence, not only on the part of those who have supported the Bill but will quickly extend to those who like myself differ from it.

If these predictions which appeared in one of the Government papers that ten dollars and twelve dollars was to be the respective values of Labrador and shore fish, if in the fall of the year, due to these arbitrary enactments, competition is destroyed, confidence will fail altogether. The success that has attended the realization of the produce of this country has arisen out of competition. If we destroy competition and destroy initiative, we injure this industry.

I cannot give my assent to the Bill and I desire to place on record those opinions. I view with much apprehension, the investing of the Board with power to do practically what it wishes. And while we give them credit for aiming at improving matters, we can see the temptation that will beset them. In dealing with their own vessels, it will be human for them to look after themselves. But on the broad principle that you fetter the enterprise of a community which for centuries has been carrying on this business on the present basis, frame the measure without any precedent from other countries and alter the condition of affairs of a country, and when you are instituting a course that a large country would not dare enter upon and for which there is no precedent in any trade, and when you leave open to jealousy the laws of supply and demand, which, after all, govern prices in every country, and in every trade, you are taking a course which in my humble opinion will be detrimental to the country. Consequently in placing myself on record as opposed to this measure I do so because I honestly believe it will be to the prejudice of the Colony and not conducive to its welfare.

HON. MR. RYAN:—Mr. President, I wish to say a few words on this Bill. I fully concur with the remarks of my honourable friend, Mr. Grieve, and I know something of the regulations since last November. I had only a small lot of fish, which I handed over to Mr. Hawes last March. I wired to

Mr. Hawes, who is supposed to be the great man for Newfoundland, on the 19th of June, and on the 27th of June he had the politeness to reply to my message. I therefore on the 4th of July cabled my own brokers in London to know from Mr. Hawes if this fish of mine shipped on the 14th of March last were sold, and, as I expected, the message which I now hold in my hand says: "550 quintals Labrador fish Hawes reports nothing sold." Now that is caused by the fish regulations. I could have sold this fish last March, the early part of March, at 65 shillings in Liverpool. I was prevented from doing so because the regulation price was 70 shillings in Liverpool. I offered it, as I said before here, to Mr. Brooks and Mr. Barr for 60 shillings. I was quite willing to accept 60 shillings, but neither would buy this fish from me. I offered to land it in Liverpool, but although they prevented me from selling at 65 shillings they would not buy themselves at 60. My fish went over there; went from Liverpool to Alicante, from Alicante to Valentia, and it is still there. We have heard a great deal about Mr. Hawes and what he was doing in selling these steamers' cargo last year. The people have not got their money yet. Now that is caused by the fish regulations prices, and any man who shipped fish know it. On the Buchanan there was an allowance made to the purchasers of that cargo of from 1s. to 8s. 6d. per quintal, and Mr. Hawes allowed the rebate; and also the exporters of the cargo had to pay 1s. 9½d. demurrage while the steamer was held up. Such a thing we have to do under the fish regulation prices, and if the Government intends to have regulation prices, why certainly those who export the fish will know more about it after the thing is over. They will have to meet their losses and smile, and I am fully aware that when those men who exported the fish that is now in Spain and Portugal get their Account Sales next December and January they will smile the wrong way. I am quite adverse to fixed regulation prices for fish and shall certainly vote against the Bill now before this Chamber.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Before the motion is put, Mr. President, I would like to say a few words, because when the Bill was going through I did not happen to be present, and moreover developments with respect to one aspect of this matter have arisen to which I would like to call attention, and as I think I was the speaker referred to by my honourable friend opposite who said this was an experiment and he was prepared to take a chance on it, I would restate my position. I have always regarded the Bill as an experiment. It is part of a series of measures presented in this House with the object of regulating the price of fish. I personally have no expectation that these measures will realize anything like the success that is hoped for them, but at the same time the matters involved are so great from the point of view of the public interest that I did not see that I would be justified in refusing to support the Bill, because, after all, if this policy proves a disastrous policy, then the evidence of that disaster would be seen sufficiently far ahead to enable those who are entrusted with the carrying out of the measure to avert the worse consequences from the country. There is no legislation of the kind in any country in the world at the present time, nor have I been able to find anybody who knows of similar legislation in the past. The Hon. Mr. Gibbs spoke of conditions in the Middle Ages, but without the knowledge of the peculiar circumstances surrounding that legislation it would be difficult for me to judge of its value, and moreover, it will hardly be urged by anybody that

conditions which applied during the time when the Western World was unknown and when trade was done within the confines of what is only the Western part of Europe could be applicable to conditions at the present time. During the course of the War we had legislation of this character, designed to deal with conditions arising out of the War, but every country is trying to get away from that legislation as fast as possible. United States has gone out of the control of one of the principal exporting commodities, wheat.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—That is not so.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—The honourable gentleman says that is not so in the United States. I can only say that Government control of the wheat crop at Washington ended on the 30th day of April last. I brought along with me the Montreal Gazetter of Monday, the 25th of June, which gives details of debates on the passage of the Wheat Bill. The Bill continued for a further twelve months the control of the Wheat Export Board of Canada. Sir George Foster, who was in charge of the Bill, says that it provides for the extension of the Wheat Board beyond the present summer if needed. He explains that the Act would not necessarily be put into effect, but the Government would have the necessary authority. I am not going to read it in detail, but the sentiment of the House was aginst the continuance of the regulation of the export of this commodity, and this Board was extended for the present year because of the conditions which existed in connection with contracts and because it was felt that it might be desirable in view of the situation that the Government should have power to deal with emergencies, but there was a general recognition of the fact that this wheat control should not be continued beyond the present year. In view of these facts I think I am safe in saying that other countries are abandoning the policy of the control of commodities as rapidly as possible. Whether this policy will be successful or not only time can tell. My opinion with regard to that aspect of the Bill is that the idea in the minds of the public is that Government control can fix prices and maintain them in competition with other parts of the world, and that therefore it is desirable in everybody's interest that this question should be settled once and for all. The legislation is there; it is complete so far as the Government feels it requires it. The necessary machinery is there to apply all the principles in the fullest extent and to derive therefrom the greatest benefit which those who favor this policy expect to derive from it. If the policy brings about the results expected to follow from it, then these gentlemen will claim, and deservedly claim, the credit; the country will get the benefit. On the other hand, if the policy fails, these gentlemen will have to assume the responsibility, and I hope in that contingency steps will be taken sufficiently far ahead to avert the worst consequences that will ensue. Within the next year or two it will be demonstrated conclusively whether this policy is feasible or not. I have no expectation that it can be made the success that is expected, because I do not see how, with the war-stricken area of Europe trying to produce codfish and other food necessaries and being satisfied with a lower standard of living, we can successfully compete with these countries, particularly if our exporters are to be subject to Government control as to price. However, this is question, as Mr. Asquith says, where "We must wait and see." With regard to the collection of nearly half a million dollars to be expended in carrying out the Bill, there

is something to be said. I think most people are agreed, but I believe on a mistaken premises, that it is desirable to spend a lot of money for that is regarded as scientific research. If I may say so, in my opinion all that money is going to be wasted. To begin with, we cannot hope, with the limited money at our disposal, to get the class of man we should have. In the second place, the work is being done by our neighbours on both sides of the Atlantic. The United States maintains an organization at the cost of millions of dollars for studying all these aspects of the industry, and this we are now to attempt to undertake, with two men and a boy, figuratively speaking. I do not think any man we employ will give us anything like an adequate return for the money we are going to spend. Some gentlemen will remember a Professor from Norway having come across the Atlantic in company with Mr. Harvey, an eminent English scientist, to study sea and fish conditions. They produced a book. I have a copy of it which they sent me. It was a very exhaustive study of such questions as currents and temperatures. We are now going to start in and do all this again. Our Canadian neighbours have a Department with a specialist in charge to do exactly the same work. Six weeks ago the Canadian authorities brought on a scientist from Scotland to study the matter, and all this material is available, and why we should spend hundreds of thousands of dollars with the idea that we are going to get anything of any value passes my comprehension.

Having said these things, Mr. President, I would say in conclusion—I say for the purposes of going on record, because I believe that it is well that when one has strong feelings on a matter of this kind he should make the position perfectly clear—that the argument was put forward in a recent bye-election that the Bill was supported in the Upper House. Well, everybody here knows the view I took and the efforts I made to have this Bill made ful, I am glad to say. My position on clearer—efforts which were successthe general principles remains the same. It is an experiment, and because the people who want to conduct the experiment are, I believe, sincere in it and hope for the best, I am prepared to give them, so far as I am concerned, my support, but I have no expectation that the experiment will be anything like the success that they believe it will. I give my support to the measure with that qualification.

Committee rose, and reported the Bill passed with amendments.

It was then read a third time and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message informing that body that the Council had passed the same with amendments.

On motion the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act to Confirm a Contract on the Subject of the Manufacture of Paper Pulp and Wood Products."

Hon. Mr. Cook in the chair.

Committee rose and reported the Bill having passed without amendment. It was then read a third time and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message informing that body that the Council had passed the same without amendment.

On motion the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act Respecting the Dominion Co-operative Building Association, Limited."

Hon. Mr. Bell in the chair.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—Mr. Chairman, I am very anxious indeed that in connection with this Bill the fullest information which is in our power shall be given. I have brought with me, Mr. Chairman, the plans of the houses that we propose to build,

and I shall table it. I have also with me plans of the land laid out for the first part of the scheme, which I shall also lay on the table of the House. I shall briefly refer to the fact that it is the intention of the Company in the first part of its program to build six hundred houses. Two hundred and fifty of the houses will be built in blocks of five, and the Committee will see that each block is of different design. The second part of the program I do not intend to make reference to just now. The guarantee sought is the ordinary guarantee given by the Government to companies; it is to provide that—

No payment shall be made except upon the certificate of the Auditor General of Newfoundland. In order to obtain such certificate the Company shall furnish to the Minister of Finance and Customs at the end of each year, during the said term of twenty years, a full and correct statement of the receipts and expenditure of the Company for the preceding year, and shall afford all proper facilities to the Auditor General to make a complete examination of the books, accounts and vouchers of the Company, in conjunction with an Auditor to be appointed by the Company. In the event of any dispute arising between the two Auditors in relation to the said statement, the same shall be referred to the determination of a public chartered accountant as umpire, to be appointed by the two Auditors. The award of such umpire shall be final and conclusive.

Now the auditors of the company are Messrs. Read, Son & Watson, who are well recognized auditors in the community.

The Bill provides that—

All construction and building materials and machinery imported into this Colony by the Company for use in its said business, which are of a kind and description not manufactured in this Colony, shall, for a period of twenty years from the first day of January, A.D. 1920, be admitted free of duty and that one-third of the directors of the company shall be appointed by the Government.

That, Mr. Chairman, is a brief outline of the Bill. I beg to move that section 1 be adopted.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Before the first section is put I would like to make a few observations. I am sure everybody will agree with the idea of having houses built, and everybody, I think, is disposed to give praise to the gentlemen who have assiciated themselves with this project, but I do not think, and I am not speaking in a critical sense, I do not think this measure is going to accomplish anything like the results that are expected to come from it; for this reason: it tries, as I see it, to "sit on two stools," which is proverbially an invitation to disaster, because it has a philanthropic side and it has a practical side, or, as I see it, no practical side. Now I understood the honourable gentleman to say yesterday that he or his company had about $40,000.00.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—We have $50,000.00 in cash.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—As I see it, this money that is given is philanthropic money that is being given by people with the object of assisting the public. I do not think, but I am subject to correction, that the honourable gentleman can expect to get a dollar for this project with the idea in the mind of the man who gives it that he is ever going to get any substantial return, because the highest interest that is offered is only five per cent., and a man can go down to-day and buy Government bonds at five and a half per cent., and he has no risk whatever. A man was telling me this morning that he was buying bonds at five and a half, and with the premium on that, he

would make about six and a half. That absolutely bars the honourable gentleman from getting any money except philanthropic money, and the amount of philanthropic money he is going to get will be limited.

In saying this be it understood I am not criticising the scheme of the hon. gentleman or the support which the Government gave him; I think the Government could do no less. I think tho', the Government ought to have done somewhat more, that is, assisted other people. They ought to have made it possible for builders to undertake the same thing as my hon. friend, and in order to prove my case I am going to show what they are doing in England. There has recently been published a journal of parliaments of the Empire and the January edition, page 66, deals with the housing problem in the Old Country and shows the support which the British Government is giving. I may say, broadly speaking, the British Government is prepared to give any building contractor or association undertaking to put up houses of an approved kind, i.e. to say workingmen houses, the sum of £130 or say $650 as a bonus for a cottage containing living room, two bedrooms and comprising not less than 700 superficial feet of floor area; for three bedrooms $700; for living room, parlor and three or four bedrooms, 920 feet, $800. The hon. gentleman said yesterday the British Government were proceeding on his program, and that in no case were communities in the Old Country of over $100,000 getting any support from the Government. The N. Y. Times of Sunday, June 27, has a very exhaustive and interesting article on this very subject. It is written by Captain ———? and is well worth anybody reading it and will give an idea of what is really being done. I will read a section. (Read extract).

In that case the British Government recognizing the absolute need of the situation and the fact that to-day the cost of a house which before the war cost approximately $1200 there is now about $4000. They have realized as you will see that it is not possible to get this housing problem solved without giving very substantial subsidies which range from $600-$800—according to the class of house which is going to be built. Now I think the Government in addition to supporting this scheme ought to have done something of a larger character because I am satisfied it will not be possible to accomplish by this scheme what is hoped. The argument has been made that this scheme so far as being beneficial will injure. I do not give this as my view, but that of the Mayor and the Municipal Council which was embodied in the petition presented to the Lower House a few days ago. The argument is made that because the hon. gentlemen has come into the field offering houses for rent, it will be useless for the Council to build houses for sale, because no one will want to buy one when they can rent one of these, and no outside builder will build houses for the same reason. Now that is the position and therefore it is easily conceivable that the hon. gentleman will get a certain amount of philanthropic money to build houses and when that is exhausted then the Municipal Council efforts will have been nullified in the meantime and we may actually find ourselves worse off than we are to-day. Now that is the objection to the Bill as I see it to-day. In order further to show the difficulty on this side of the Atlantic I would like to read something of the Board of Trade report of the City of Toronto where on page 15, this subject is dealt with. They have an unpaid Commission of seven members dealing with the problem. It says: (Read extract).

This Committee went out on the

quiet and bought a lot of land at a low figure and through that fact and the fact that they were giving their services for nothing it has been found possible to give the people houses at a low figure and deal satisfactory with it. The Canadian Government has given $25,000,000 divided amongst the provinces, and the provincial governments have also given monies, the idea being that people be aided by monetary assistance. The municipalities are dealing as best they can and nowhere has much more progress been made than our own Municipal Council is doing, except in Halifax where conditions were extraordinary, due to the explosion which wiped out the workingmen's section of Halifax altogether, and the Dominion Government recognizing it as a war obligation voted a very large sum to the rebuilding of it, and appointed a Committee to carry out the work, with Thomas Adams, the greatest expert of modern times, and here in the N.Y. Times they have a plan showing it. But these aspects do not concern us, but this I know, if the Government could see its way clear to giving assistance to building contractors, the same facilities as given to the hon. gentleman's company, we would get further along. I asked a builder a few days ago about this matter and he estimated the advantages the hon. gentleman was getting as equivalent to about $400 on a house, and he said no man would build houses now because people would want to get one of these houses. And the idea that they are ever going to build 600 houses I think we ought to demiss from our minds as a phantasy of the extremest kind. But assuming that these houses are built, how does the hon. gentleman expect to deal with them? If for rent, we will not get much further because the least desirable class in the community I think all will agree is the renter. If the houses are to be sold people would have a continued interest in them, and would see they are looked after. I think it is the experience of all that the people renting houses and jumping from one place to another are the most destructive class to have for houses. I asked yesterday if he was going to sell houses and he said yes, and I asked how and he said as the tenant wishes. Well that is a very visionary and unsatisfactory way to deal with a problem of this kind. He criticised the Municipal Council strongly because of the draft lease which the Council has embodied in its charter.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—I have all the statistics. We are dealing with a housing problem in a small country and are making a very small effort to try to put the position, as it ought to be. There are 975 houses in St. John's not fit for human habitation and it is a very humble effort we are making to try to relieve that. I have not the slightest doubt we will get the capital.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—The hon. gentleman says he has all the statistics, and I think that is all the trouble. He has too many statistics. I would remind the hon. gentleman that a year ago he had entirely a different plan.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—Just the same plan exactly.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—He had a scheme of getting people to take shares of 20c. a month.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—If you have a better scheme let us have it.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—That is not the question. He wrote the papers about a scheme whereby people were to contribute 20 cents a month. Now what has become of that scheme? Is not the reason why because the hon. gentleman got such a poor reception he abandoned it. He advocated a scheme to build houses and it came to nothing.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—The rea-

son it came to nothing is because the Government turned it down.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Well I know nothing about that. But the hon. gentleman had this scheme and I do not know what became of it. I am not here as an apologist for the late Government or a critic of the present oGvernment, but to criticise this scheme on its merits. I know the hon. gentleman may say it is all very well to criticise and I recognize that is a fair retort, but after all that is what we are here for and I should be very sorry to outstep the limits of reasonable criticism. But the hon. gentleman has taken the position that this is the only scheme and I do not think that a correct position to take.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—What I said was this: (Read extract).

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—That is very well as far as it goes. Now let us analyse it. The hon. gentleman says he is prepared to build houses for working-men, the Municipal Council is building houses also. The hon. gentleman's house, as I understand, is to cost $1500, the Municipal Council's house is to cost $2000. I do not know that there is any serious difference in the character of the houses, they may be a bit cheaper. The hon. gentleman says that working-men will never be able to buy the houses because the Council's terms are too excessive. This is a matter for analysis. The Municipal Council puts its cards upon the table. They intend to build houses not to rent but to sell. The terms of sale are so and so. The man wishing to buy will pay 25% of purchase money on cash mortgage, to cover payment over certain years. This is a business proposition. When I ask the hon. gentleman on what terms he proposes to sell, he answers, "On any terms, within twenty years." Does he think people are going to take this seriously. I do not think it a feasible proposition. How is he going to sell the houses on any terms? The hon. gentleman must have a cut and dried plan by which he intends to seil. If he is only going to rent and

HON. MR. GIBBS:—According to the agreement of the hon. gentleman who has just finished speaking no money will be invested in this scheme for building workingmen's houses except it be that of philanthrophists. The hon. gentleman is entirely wrong. There are a great many working people in this city prepared to invest on the weekly, monthly and quarterly installment plan in this association in order that a home may be provided for them, others are prepared to subscribe to its capital stock, as soon as the Association actually commences operations. The hon. gentleman found fault with the provisions of the bill because a higher rate of interest will not be paid to the shareholder. He evidently forgets that there are millions of dollars on deposit in the Canadian Banks doing business in this country upon which but three percent interest is paid. The security which the Canadian Banks offer is no better than that of this Co-operative Association. When the interest of the public is aroused the stability of this organization will be reassured. The public will be induced to subscribe to the capital stock as they will get two per cent more upon the moneys invested than the banks would pay. It is all a matter of properly conducted propaganda. The aims and objects of the Association will be explained to the public. When this will be done, ample funds will be found to carry on its objects. The hon. gentleman says no man will buy a house when he can rent one. The recklessness of his statement is only too apparent. The desire to own a home is inherent. It is one of those things implanted in us by nature which induces good order and adds to the

stability of society so necessary in those turbulent times. Any man who can possibly procure a home for himself is going to do so. This Association is going to afford him the ways and means to own a home. The manner in which this will be done is purely a matter of detail. The hon. gentleman who introduced this bill cannot now state what the directors of the Company may do in the future, or how they propose to enable a man to purchase the house he is living in. It is not a very difficult matter to work out the details of a scheme by which a workingman paying certain weekly, monthly or quarterly amounts extending over a period of ten, twelve or fifteen years may become his own landlord. The Association has in view such a scheme, it is not intended that the profits of the Association will be as great as i fa Loan & Investment Company were engaged in similar business and operated for the benefit of shareholders.

Another objection of the hon. gentleman was that the provisions of this bill will restrict building operations by private enterprise. My answer to this objection is, should human beings be forced to live in hovels and await the pleasure of private enterprise to remedy the evil. Are we going by our action to compel people to live in unsanitary houses for years until private enterprise solves the problem. Nobody can seriously contend but that private enterprise has failed and that because of its failure the state is asked to apply the remedy which is the aim of this bill. The manner in which Great Britain is attempting to solve this problem it is argued by him should be applied here. Conditions there and here are different. The housing problem in England is universal. It exists not alone in the cities and towns but in the rural sections as well. The housing problem in this country applies solely to this city. The people living outside this city are their own landlords. We have no land-owning class in the outports of this country but in England it is the contrary. If we go back a few centuries in English history we find a desire upon the part of the landowner to be freed from the obligations of feudalism. There was a desire also on the part of the King to be independent of Parliament, in his income. The result was that the landlords in return for being freed from the obligations of feudalism were to contribute to the King annually a tax equal to one-fifth on the then rental value of their land. To this was added an excise tax with this object of relieving the land of the barons from taxation, and place the burden of government on the backs of the poor. A century later advantage was taken of the French wars and an Act was passed by which the landlords annual contribution was fixed at two millions of pounds, subsequent enactments reduced it to one million two hundred thousand pounds at which sum it remains to-day. The land has never since been revalued. It is estimated that it has increased in value nearly two thousand per cent since that time; but those who own the land has never permitted it to be re-assessed. Were the land held by those landlords revalued as is the land in Canada and United States this land-owning class would pay forty million pounds a year instead of one million two hundred thousand pounds. The local rates in England are assessed against the tenant. They are paid by the occupier. The tenant pays the landlord his rent and then pays the city all of the taxes. The landlord reaps his harvest by the growth of population and industry which enables him ultimately to exact an monopoly price. England buys her dairy produce from Denmark and Holland not because her land is unfertile but because the landlord is under no

incentive to make use of it himself or permit another to do so. The result of this system is overcrowding in the city. There the slum is encouraged while he who labors is punished for his energy. The result of all this is that living conditions are horrible and the condition of the masses to say the least deplorable. Statistics which I shall quote will demonstrate these facts.

In Liverpool according to a paper read before the Royal Sanitary Institute in April 1905 by Mr. Fletcher T. Turton, the Liverpool Deputy Surveyor, there are still 8,600 back to back houses standing, the death rate in their area being 60 per 1000.

In Leeds there are many of these back to back houses without ventilation or yard or private sanitary arrangements, let at rentals varying from 35 and 6d. to 7s. 6d. per week. As many as three and four houses join at one closet. The closets are frequently in yards, forty yards from the house. In wet weather rather than carry waste water from the bedrooms the length of the street; women may be often seen pouring it down the streets gully. On Sundays when the inhabitants are all at home, the difficulty as to sanitary accommodation is intensely aggravated.

In Sheffield in the Potteries, and many other places those abominable back to back houses are to be found. Few workers houses in the potteries have more than two bedrooms. The back to back houses in Sheffeld number 15,000 and sometimes as many as eight or ten persons are to be found in three little rooms. If we take only seven persons to the house there are 105,000 Sheffield people living in these dens.

In Marylebone, Southwark, St. Pancras, Holborn, Bethnal Green, Shoreditch, Stepney, and Finsbury upwards of thirty per cent of the inhabitants live in tenements of one or two rooms. In Finsbury the proportion reaches 45 per cent. In Shoreditch and St. Pancras 37 per cent. In London there are many squalid areas which contain greater aggregations of the poorest of the poor than can be found in any other part of the country.

According to the investigations of men like Mr. Roundtree and Mr. Charles Booth thirty per cent. of the population are under-fed, on the verge of hunger. Thirty per cent. of forty-five million equals thirteen millions.

Number paupers relieved one in eighteen of the population.

Over sixty-five relieved one in every three.

Distribution of national income, that is prior to the war. The income was approximately about £1,710,000,000.

1,250,000 persons owned £585,000,-000 of the income.

3,750,000 people owned £245,000,-000, and 38,000,000 the balance 880,-000,000.

2,500 persons own one-half the whole area of England, while 38,200 persons own three-fourths of the area of England and Wales. Therefore, three-fourths of the rent go to the landowning class.

400 peers and peeresses 5,729,970 acres.

1288 great land owners 8,479,699 acres.

2529 squires 4, 319,271 acres.

The West Minister Review:—"No thinking man much less one who has the slightest idea of the source of wealth and prosperity of a people need be told what must necessarily be the result of such a system especially upon a people like the English, whose laboring people have reached a point of degradation unequalled in any civilized nation on earth."

The following are extracts from a report of a Royal Commission investigating housing conditions in England:

"High death rates; a pitiful increase

"in infant motality; terrible suffering "among little children; scrofula and "congenital diseases; ophthalmia, due "to dark, ill-ventilated, overcrowded "rooms; sheer exhaustion and inabil- "ity to work; encouragement of in- "fectious diseases; reducing physical "stamina and thus producing consump- "tion and diseases arising from general "debility, were some of the evils of "overcrowding."

"Here typhoid, tuberculosis and "other infectious disease thrive. From "these centres contagion spreads. Here "sweatshop work is done and here "abounds 'the courage of consumption "which doctors and boards of health "wrestle with in vain; while dying men "and women sew on coats with their "their last gasp and sew the death "warrant of the buyer in the lining.'"

In the miserable surroundings of the tenement appetites are diseased and the most degrading forms of poverty appear. For the tenement is the cause as well as the result of poverty. Foul and unsanitary conditions devitalize life and drag down the worker and in time destroy his ability to meet the competitive condition of industrial life.

From reliable statistics it appears that no fewer than 2,500,000 of London's population require better housing conditions. In Scotland twenty-two per cent of the families live in single room homes if such they may be termed, while in Glasgow the proportion runs up to thirty-three per cent.

Statistics could not exaggerate the description of Mr. Frederic Harrison, who confessed his own despondency over modern city life in England as follows:

"To me at least it would be enough to condemn modern society as hardly an advance on slavery or serfdom, if the present condition of industry were to be that which we behold; ninety per cent of the actual producers of wealth have no home which they can call their own beyond the end of the week; have no bit of soil, or so much as a room that belongs to them; have nothing of value of any kind except as much furniture as will go in a cart; have the precarious chance of weekly wages which barely suffice to keep them in health; are housed for the most part in places that no man thinks fit for his horse; are separated by so narrow a margin from destitution that a month of bad trade, sickness or unexpected loss brings them face to face with hunger and pauperism. . . . This is the normal state of the average workman in town or country."

What produced these conditions in England? Land monopoly, concentration of wealth in the hands of a few, apathy and indifference on the part of the ruling classes, and a denial of the rights of human beings.

It may be said that conditions among the people here can never reach that deplorable level which exists in England. While that is true, nevertheless we should keep before our minds that we have a housing problem in our midst and profit by the outcome of indifference of public men elsewhere.

To me, Mr. Chairman, this bill is the most important which has come before this Chamber for a great number of years. Other bills have been introduced here which have dealt with trade and industry but this is of greater importance. One of the ends attained by the passage of this bill will be better citizenship, and if we create such conditions trade and industry must flourish.

The family is the corner stone of society, the foundation upon which it rests, that foundation cannot be secure if certain natural rights be denied it. One of these rights is that it be given an opportunity to live in reasonable frugal comfort. Can we in all sincerity say that this opportunity is afforded

the people as a whole in this city? Such is not the case.

Millions in the world are denied this opportunity and are compelled to live under conditions which do not tend to the good order and stability of society. Thousands of people here are living in homes which are the breeders of discontent and disease. In such homes family duties cannot be performed nor can the training of children be properly carried on. The most important period of a child's life is when it needs the care and attention of its mother. This attention cannot be given if the home be unsanitary and unfit for habitation, or if industrial conditions are such that the mother has to leave home to supplement the earninsg by work. It is often at the expense and suffering of the boy or the girl that industry is developed and we little regard what the cost is.

To have one sweet home that is safe and true, ten garrets must reek in the darkened streets.

"It is not our fault" says the rich ones,
"No, 'tis the fault of a system old and
strong,
But men are makers of systems;
So the cure will come if we own the
wrong."

There are certain instances in which the State does grievous wrong. Take for example the mother who is rearing children. Look at the care and attention she bestows on them. She tries to raise them healthy and strong, and she succeeds in doing so. She sends them out into the industrial life of the city to earn their living and to work at whatever their occupation may be, and very often she has to see these children dying of town disease, because of the unsanitary conditions under which the State forces them to live, dying because of the foul atmosphere which they are compelled to breathe. What right has the State to expose the offspring of that woman to disease and to premature death? Nevertheless, it goes on day after day, week after week, and month after month, and will go on until a scheme of this kind which has been proposed by my hon. friend, the gentleman in charge of this bill is brought into effect and an effort made to remedy the evil. There must be an effort made. If the hon. gentleman does not succeed in all his hopes he will have the satisfaction of knowing that he made an honest and sincere effort in trying to leave this city better than he found it. If we look at the question of housing from a purely materialistic standpoint, it is absolutely necessary that people should have proper houses. What is the greatest asset of a country? Is it its trade? Is its mineral resources? Is it its shipping and export trade? No, it is none of these. What is then? The greatest asset of a country is the boy and the girl, because without them neither the mine would be worked nor the trade or industries of the country carried on and the ships would rot at their anchors. And applying that reasoning, it is absolutely necessary that this asset should be protected, preserved and given a chance to develop along proper lines. Supposing you are the owner of something you prize very much. What do you do? Do you expose it to danger of being lost? If it is something very valuable, what do you do with it? You place it in an iron safe. Well, then there is the boy and the girl, far more valuable, and still they are exposed to risk and danger of dying of what is now known as town disease. We all know that it is only the healthy and vigorous who can keep pace with the constant strain which present day industrial conditions demand. If by our apathy, we produce a weak race, trade and industry must decline. This question of housing has

become one of decent human existence the world over. As I have said, in England it has become an Imperial problem, because it was found that not alone does it affect the question of the ability of the English workman to produce as compared with workmen in other parts of the world, but the Army and Navy found they could not get men to measure up to the standard required according to the regulations. We cannot argue from the standpoint that because England is doing something so vital to the welfare and safety of the nation that we should act in a similar manner here. If we could do it, I would be only too glad to see it being done, but I submit it would hardly be fair to ask two-thirds of the public living outside the city to contribute a proportionate amount, but I say it is only just that the State should be asked to contribute along reasonable lines, and when that is done, I think it is doing all that is reasonably required. Personally, I do not like too much State interference. I think the less of State interference the better, but when that interference becomes necessary, such as in a matter of this kind, then the aid of the State should be invoked. This Association has asked the Government for certain concessions. These concessions have been granted. We got no less than we asked, and for that, those connected with the scheme are grateful, grateful because they feel that much good will be accomplished in the future. A number of the workingmen of this city have invested in the capital sotck of the company in the hope and in the full assurance that their hopes are going to be realized, that they will in the future be the owners of their own homes. As to details, nobody can say exactly upon what lines they are going to be worked out, because that is a matter of discussion for the directorate. The directorate there will be clever business men who are used to dealing with finance and matters of that kind, and who will work out upon reasonable and practical lines the question of how a man may purchase his own home.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I do not wish to prolong the debate. I merely ask the indulgence of this House for a few brief observations. The honourable gentleman said in the first place, with regard to the question of security, that the fact that there were millions of dollars in the banks at three per cent, and this company will give fire per cent, is a sufficient answer to the statement that money will not be invested. Well I meet that argument in this way: The security of the concern, he thinks, is a good as the security behind the Canadian banks. Well, possibly he thinks so; I doubt whether he will get many people of the country to agree with him. In the second place, I would like to point out that for whatever the Canadian bank security is valuable, it is valuable both for the principal and interest, but in this case the Government only guarantees five per cent interest for twenty years and there is no question as to when the man is going to get his money back. Then I am told there are millions of dollars at three per cent while securities of five and a half and six and a half are going begging, but the answer to that is that the people who put their money at three per cent do it for two or three reasons. Some of them have a certain amount and want it available for business and other purposes when they require it. Some are hypersentitive on the question of security and would rather have their money in the Government Savings Bank or in the other banks than invest it in anything else. I think that is not an extreme position. We found that obstacle in connection with the First Victory Loan at six and a half per cent; millions of dollars still lay in the

Government Savings Bank and the Canadian banks, the security behind the debentures that were paying twice the interest being the same as the security behind the Government Savings Bank. Consequently, I submit, the class of people who put their money in the banks is not the class who will take it out to buy stock in this proposition. Now the next point my honourable friend made was that he asked, should building be stopped under this scheme because private enterprise will not come into the field. Well I say, No. I do not say any project should be stopped; but I say this project ought to be assisted on the same footing as other companies may be.

The honourable gentleman then gave us a very interesting dissertation on the Peers and Charles the First and the arrangement between them by which the landed classes were to get certain concessions which incidentally cost that monarch his head. The honourable gentleman then brought us down to comparatively recent times with a description of the conditions which existed in England up to recently, but he stopped—I do not say he did it purposedly—he stopped short of the latest development. Ten years ago Lloyd George, as every reader of world politics is aware, launched a scheme for the revaluation of the land of England. He conducted a most vehement campaign against the landed classes and there was to be a complete valuation of land. Well, I wonder if any honourable gentleman knows what has happened. The scheme was abandoned within the last month, on the ground that there would not be enough money received because of the revaluation to pay the expenses.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—Because the landed classes and the manufacturers can do what they like in England.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—That may be the explanation, and I am not saying this as criticism, but merely to say that there is another side to the question. But that is the fact, that Lloyd George, after taking up this scheme, had to abandon it.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—Like many other schemes.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I do not know of anybody who has abandoned more. The honourable gentleman then spoke of the dreadful conditions in England. I might say I had the papers and the Hanzard here last year in connection with the question of renting houses, and I intended to read some extracts from the Royal Commission, but they were too horrible to put on the records of this House, and I will simply let it pass by saying that conditions in certain parts of the British Isles are too terrible to contemplate. But where does that get us? The honourable gentleman then went on to say in one breath that because conditions in this country were not as bad as in England we ought not to go as far.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—The argument advanced was that because the Government in England was giving so much, then something along these lines might be done here.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I thought that some consideration ought to be given to building societies and building contractors so that building by other agencies might proceed at the same time. But then the honourable gentleman having taken the position that because conditions were not as bad here, we should not do as they are doing, went on to say that thousands were living under filthy and unsanitary conditions. Well if that is so, that is an argument for doing the utmost possible. Are we doing the utmost possible?

HON. MR. GIBBS:—Yes.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Perhaps we are. Then, assuming that we are asking the whole country to assist

the town of St. John's, are we doing too much, because, remember, that is what we are doing. The housing problem in Canada to-day is the housing problem in Newfoundland—not housing for rural districts, but for cities, and the Canadian Government is asking the whole country to help.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—It is a problem for the whole of Canada.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Pardon me, but I say the principle is sound that if the Province of Canada, if the Federal Government of Ottawa, is contributing money to build houses for cities, not for the rural districts, and if Provincial Governments are contributing money to build houses for the cities, surely it is not too much to ask that this country should contribute something to building houses for the city. I do not think progress could be made as rapidly as the honourable gentleman suggests. I understood that he said these houses would be ready for Christmas. Well, I do not think they will be. I think they will be lucky if they get them ready for next Chirstmas, and in saying that I am not throwing any doubt upon his good faith, but the Municipal Council took nearly that time to build twelve houses, and he has to build thirty. But while we are discussing this thing in the aspects which it presents to us, I think we ought not to forget that while we all agree with what the honourable gentleman has said in his very illuminating closing of his remarks about the moral, social and material aspects of it, there is this fact, that if there are nine hundred and seventy-five houses in St. John's that are unfit for habitation at present, and if there is the unrest existing that is suggested, with the natural increase in population and the influx upon us of people from other parts of the Island, there will very speedily arise a condition when people who have not houses and who cannot see any houses in sight except what houses may result from this project, may take measures that are more vigorous to see houses are provided, and I think it is a matter that those gentlemen who are responsible for the measure ought to give careful consideration. I do not think I am saying too much when I say that one can see evidences that many in this community are now taking the view that if they cannot get through peaceful means what they think they are entitled to they may take other means to secure it. In my judgment, I hope this is all I will have to say on the matter, the time is approaching when this problem will have to be grappled with in a more comprehensive manner or else we may see troublous times as a result of our failure to do so.

HON. THE PRESIDENT:—I intended to say something on this matter, but owing to the lateness of the evening I will confine myself to two or three words. I wish it to be understood that this was not ever intended, so far as I am aware, to have any political element. I was entirely to be free from politics; otherwise I would not have undertaken the share that I did take in it. The land was secured for the purposes of helping the people who needed houses. It was secured at a very nominal rent owing to the nature of the houses that were going to be built. This company does not contend with the Municipal Council. We wish them the best of good luck. We had nothing to say to them. If any friction came in, it was unjust to many people who were concerned. We wish them all good luck, and if they put up nine or ten or twelve houses, we will only say that we wish they had put up fifty or a hundred, so as to enable the city to have better housing. But I would say that if we put up only thirty houses, and if we do not make them a financial success, I think the parties

who have offered the money will be glad if we put in these houses thirty families for the winter, even if they do not get any interest at all, but if we are in the way of any corporation or private persons, I as one of the parties would have nothing to do with it. We hope that there are plenty of builders in this city that if they had no business now have plenty of room to go on with other building. To have this turned down because many will not take out money from the Savings Bank at three per cent and put it into an undertaking like this where there is a Government undertaking of five per cent, is not a matter for congratulation to the holders of moneys in the Savings Bank, while they can help their neighbours and make five per cent on their money at the same time. I wish to congratulate the energy of the gentleman who has charge of this Bill because he had some adverse times in connection with it, but I hope that his activity will meet with success. I purposed to make some other remarks, but as the hour is so late I will not now.

The Committee on the Dominion Building Bill rose and reported the same without amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Anderson the said Bill was then read a third time and passed and it was ordered that a message be sent the House of Assembly that this House had passed the said Bill without amendment.

On motion of Hon. Dr. Campbell the Paper and Pulp Products Co. Bill was read a third time and passed and a message was sent the House of Assembly that this House had passed the same.

Hon. Mr. Gibbs moved that the report of the Select Committee on the Seal Fishery Bill be referred to Committee of the Whole House on to-morrow.

House then adjourned until to-morrow at four o'clock.

FRIDAY, July 9th, 1920.

House met at 4 p.m. pursuant to adjournment.

On motion the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill entitled "An Act to Amend the Newfoundland Patriotic Fund Act, 1915."

Hon. Mr. McNamara in the Chair.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—Mr. Chairman, on the second reading of this Bill I would briefly explain the purpose of the amendments to the Act now on the Statute Book. The War having come to an end, the verbiage, at least, of some of the classes would have to be altered ,and also some of the powers which applied to affairs then existing require to be re-established, and this Bill is simply an amendment in that direction. Section 3 is repealed and the following substituted therefor:

The objects of the corporation shall be to collect, administer and distribute the fund hereinbefore mentioned for the assistance, in case of need, of the wives, children and dependents of officers and men, residents of Newfoundland, who, during the late War of 1914-1918 were on active service with the naval and military forces of the British Empire and Great Britain's Allies.

By comparing that with the clause in the original Act we see we are dealing with a new condition of affairs. We want the amendment so as to enable us to deal with dependents when the War ended, not with dependents when the War was in progress.

HON. MR. MEWS:—Might I ask whether this covers anyone outside the Newfoundland Regiment and the Newfoundland Royal Naval Reserve. The section reads "Residents of Newfoundland."

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—The section includes residents of Newfoundland who served in connection with the

Newfoundland military and naval service.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—If you read the Bill very carefully you will see it provides for those dependents of Newfoundland not alone who served in the Newfoundland Army and Navy forces, but who served with the Naval and Military forces of the British Empire and the Allies. It is comprehensive enough to take in all these. During the operation of the Patriotic Fund for the past six years those dependents of Newfoundlanders who served with Canadians were cared for by the Canadian Patriotic Fund and the Canadian Patriotic Fund appointed the Newfoundland Patriotic Association as its agents, and we disbursed money from month to month and got a refund from Ottawa. As to those who served with any Allies, it would be possible under this Act to assist them, but of course we have no such cases. In Canada they have assisted them.

The Committee on the Newfoundland Patriotic Fund Act 1915 rose and reported the same without amendment.

Said 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 without amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Gibbs the House went into Committee of the Whole on the Seal Fishery Amendment Bill.

Hon. Mr. Winter in the chair.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—When this Bill was last before the House a Select Committee was appointed for the purpose of considering certain amendments whereby the Bill could be made more workable, practicable and beneficial than it was. That Committee has had the Bill under consideration and have recommended certain amendments which the Committee feel will commend themselves to hon. gentlemen.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill with some amendment.

The Bill was then 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.

HON. MR. SHEA moved the second reading of the Treaties Bill and said:—This is a copy of the Canadian Act and it is for the purpose of giving the Governor-in-Council power to take the necessary steps for carrying out the treaties of peace entered into between His Majesty's Government and Foreign Powers.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Might I call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact the Canadian Parliament dealing with this matter the other day obtained power to ratify and carry out the other treaties, with Bulgaria, &c. Why not make one job of it? At the prorogation at Ottawa a week ago to-day the following reference was made to this very subject: (Read extract).

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

HON. THE PRESIDENT read messages from the Assembly that they had passed the amendments to the Codfish Exportation Bill, without amendment; also Bill to amend the Education Act; An Act relating to amendment to the Law re Keeping of Dogs; An Act to provide for the Collection and Distribution of the Estates of certain Esquimaux deceased and an Act relating to Trustee Investment; in which they requested the Council's concurrence.

Said Trustee Investment Bill was then read a first and second time, and House went into Committe of the Whole thereon; Hon. Mr. Steer in the chair.

The Committe rose and reported it had passed the Bill with an amendment.

An Act to amend Chapter 143 of the

Consolidated Statutes of Newfoundland (Third Series) entitled "Of the Keeping of Dogs" was read for the first and also a second time and was then referred to Committe of the Whole House.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—It is very appropriate that this Bill should come up in the "Dog Days" of the session. Hitherto the law as it stood made it lawful for persons other than police constables to destroy dogs when not in call or control of their owners. The amended section 32 excepts shepherd dogs and collies, "and all such dogs not so excepted may be killed by any person whomsoever; and it shall be lawful for any person to destroy any dog kept in contravention of the provisions of the said section." The next section makes it lawful for any person to keep properly trained shepherd dogs or collies.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—What constitutes properly trained shepherd dogs or collies? I know of only two trained collies in Newfoundland. This will lead to a lot of shooting.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—The keeping of these collie dogs when untrained and in many cases of mongrel breed would be to take advantage of the Bill.

HON. MR. SHEA:—Does this apply to the dogs in the outports?

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I would suggest that the Department of Agriculture and Mines issue certificates with respect to properly trained dogs. This would protect the dogs and at the same time make it possible for untrained or uncertificated dogs to be shot.

HON. MR. SHEA:—A man may have a valuable dog untrained. If a policeman were to come along and shoot this dog, what redress would the man have?

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—I remember on a previous occasion this dog question provided considerable discussion. At that time it was suggested to refer them to the Council of Higher Education to see if they could pass certain examinations. This is a new Bill dealing with collie dogs. What about the "Spot on the Crackie?" The trouble is he is not at large. He is referred to a Select Committee. I hope the greatest care will be exercised to distinguish the pure breed shepherd dog from the mongrel. The policeman should be instructed to distinguish the difference. These shepherd dogs when trained should look after a hundred sheep, and are really of service to a man who is a farmer of sheep.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—There are dogs in St. Mary's Bay which are very useful to the fishermen. Does this Bill give anyone the right to shoot these dogs? These dogs are valuable to their owners and I have never known them to be alleged destructive.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—If not on stated area.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—We are going to have a tall war if this Bill goes through as it is. These dogs are harmless and to shoot them would be a serious matter. Under this Bill all these dogs can be shot. It would be more satisfactory as Sir P. T. McGrath suggests that the Department of Agriculture register these shepherd dogs and collies. The policemen would not be able to distinguish.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—I agree with the Bill as to the trained shepherd dogs and trained collie dogs. There is no greater nuisance, however, than collies untrained. Any dog untrained ought not to be permitted in the country. They are a menace to children, and vicious. I certainly object that persons should be allowed to shoot dogs indiscriminately, on his own property may be all right but to go into his neighbour's grounds and shoot his neighbour's dog is monstrous. All untrained dogs should be shot but especi-

ally the collie, for it is the most vicious dog there is.

HON. MR. BELL:—I do not think a thorough-bred collie dog is dangerous. I have two and would not like to lose them. They are as intelligent as human beings, and I have yet to know any case where they have been vicious or attempted to bite in any way.

The Committee rose and reported it had passed Bill with an amendment. It was then ordered to be read a third time.

The Bill was then read a third time and it was moved that a message be sent to the House of Assembly to the effect that this House had passed the same with an amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea "An Act to provide for the Collection and Distribution of the Estates of Certain Esquimaux, Deceased," was read a first time.

HON. MR. SHEA:—In moving the second reading of this Bill I may say, it will be remembered that last year an epidemic spread over the Labrador coast and in the Moravian settlement. The inhabitants of Okak, Hebron and Saglek died of the infection, leaving estates. There is no one to deal with them. This Bill is to give power to administer. The Moravian Missionaries will probably take the matter up. They are anxious to deal with these in a legal manner. To do this, this Bill is brought before this House.

The Bill was then referred to a Committee of the Whole House.

Hon. Mr. Templeman took the chair.

On motion the Bill "An Act to Provide for the Distribution of the Estates of Certain Esquimaux, Deceased," was read a first time, read a second time; the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill; Committee rose and reported the Bill having passed without amendment; it was thereupon on motion read a third time and ordered to be sent to the House of Assembly with a message that the Council had passed the same without amendment.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Shea the Bill "An Act to Amend The Education Act" was read a first time.

HON. MR. McGRATH:—Might I ask the honourable gentleman in charge of this Bill would it be possible to have the Bill, and also the Municipal Bill printed and distributed.

HON. MR. SHEA:—I have given instructions that that be done and that the Bill be distributed to the offices of the members.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—Before the adjournment of the House may I ask in what position we are as to night letters. To the Dominion of Canada and the United States we have been sending night letters, but not to Great Britain. Now that the War is over and things are becoming normal, there is a great possibility of doing trade with the Old Country, and I would suggest to the Leader of the Government that an effort might be made to get back to the old idea of Night Letters instead of paying large sums of money for telegrams, and I think an arrangement might be made between the Government and the companies to re-establish the old system, if it can be done.

HON. MR. SHEA:—If the honourable gentleman would give notice of that formally I would be glad to take it up with the Postal Department and the Government.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—In supporting the motion on adjournment I would like to repeat my regret and say that I think, now that the dispute between the Commercial Cable Company and the Government has been settled, we ought to consider resuming relations with the company. I think that while the Anglo is a very good company, it is a mistake to depend on one string. That is one aspect of the matter. The other aspect is this, that

the Government has some two hundred and fifty Postal Telegraph offices in outports all over the country, cut off from communicating with the outside world except through the Anglo, and every message from any place, originally put into any of these offices has to be handed over by the Postal Telegraphs to the Anglo to be forwarded outward or inward, and the Postal Telegraph Department, so far as I know, gets nothing whatever for doing that. It simply acts as a collector and distributor of messages for the Anglo-American Telegraph Company without getting any remuneration therefor. This Colony put down a cable between Port aux Basques and Canso at a cost of $150,000.00. That cable has been lying unused for two years. That may have been a very sensible step to take, but now that the issue has been set tled and the Privy Council has pronounced that we were right, I should think it ought to be possible to take steps very promptly to reopen communication with the Commercial Cable Company and let us have two strings to our bow.

With reference to the matter of night letters, I am not so sure that we can get that concession, because I understand it has been cut out between the New World and the Old World within the past few months, as a result of post-war conditions, and I do not suppose that the Anglo Company, particularly while it has a monopoly in Newfoundland, is going to give us that concession when the Western Union, of which the Anglo is a branch, will not give the same concessions to people in Canada and the United States doing business with European countries. During the War while we were dealing with Militia matters, we got cablegrams at five cents a word; messages in relation to soldiers, casualties, how soldiers were progressing in hospital, and when people sent money to them, the messages went at a five-cent rate. Then there were week-end messages, deferred messages, and all that sort of thing, but that has been cut out and we are back to the rate of twenty-five cents. We ought not to continue that position very much longer, particularly in view of another fact which I might cite, that in the United States the Commercial Cable Company and its auxiliary, the Postal, cut the cost twenty per cent less than the Western Union. You can send a message from New York or any other American city to-day for twenty per cent less by the Commercial Cable Company than by the Western Union, and therefore I think that on these grounds the Government ought to try to open up that connection again.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—I quite agree with the honourable gentleman who has just sat down that it would be very desirable that some steps should be taken to see if business relations cannot be again brought about between the Commercial Cable Company and the Colony on a basis satisfactory to both. As he states, we have a great number of Postal Telegraph offices in this country and the people using them are completely cut off from doing business with the outside world except through the Anglo, and, as he properly remarks, messages handed in have to be handed over to the Anglo without the Colony's receiving any benefit of any kind. As has been stated, we have a cable across the Gulf and a station at Port aux Basques and a station at Sydney, and there are operators maintained at one at least of these points. That amount of money is another aspect, and it is this, that the Postal Telegraph business is being operated at a very serious loss to the Colony because of the lack of cable service. I should say the loss of revenue to this Colony because of the cutting off of the cable connection is not less than

$125,000 a year. It must be a very considerable amount.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—In connection with the loss in the Postal Telegraphs, that is because of the negligence of those who receive the messages. The Postal office being very close to mine, I have endeavoured to send all my messages there, and with very bad results indeed. In fact, two weeks ago I sent a message at about half past ten in the morning to Grand Falls to a customer there. The following day about a quarter to twelve they sent back to ask me the street address at Grand Falls. I did not know there were so many streets in Grand Falls. And it took them twenty-six hours before they asked for the street address. How can the Postal expect to make their system pay?

HON. MR. TEMPLEMAN:—I endorse what the honourable gentleman has said on the subject. I had a similar experience. Once this year I sent a message from Bonavista to 49 Duckworth Street, where I have been living for years, and where we are always sending messages when we are at Bonavista, and they came back with the statement that there was no such place in St. John's as 49 Duckworth Street. As to night letters, they are not much use to us at Bonavista. The offices in the outports close at eight o'clock, and if a message is received after the office opens in the evening there is no time to reply to it that night. I think that the offices in the important outports, at any rate, ought to be open until nine o'clock. For instance, if a message is sent from St. John's about half past five it does not reach Bonavista until probably half past seven; the office is closed at eight, and we have to wait until the morning and the answer is received here about ten or half past ten. We may lose contracts at any time and lose the sale of fish because of this. I think, too, that the cost of the message is too much. If instead of charging twenty cents for a message the charge is ten cents, you will find that people will do all their business by telegraph and the Postal would be making thousands of money instead of losing it.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—Not so very many years ago I was waiting for a particular invoice from Manchester. It arrived in due course. The envelope was addressed in the usual way,

John Anderson,
Merchant,
Water Street,
St. John's, Nfld.

Across the envelope was written "Not known here. Try St. John, New Brunswick." It arrived in St. John, New Brunswick, and was sent across to London, opened at the Dead Letter Office there, and sent on to Manchester. It was readdressed to me in another envelope and when it got here I made many inquiries, but could never get any light thrown on it.

HON. THE PRESIDENT:--That was before the Daylight Saving Bill.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—Yes; if it happened now, we might be able to trace it. When one year I was coming home I sent a telegraph message saying when I would arrive. I got the telegraph message two days after I reached here. As to the matter of night letters, I do not think there is any necessity for a formal motion, but it is sufficient that the Government look into the matter.

HON. MR. SHEA:—It will give me very great pleasure to see what can be done. I shall give the Government's synopsis of this debate and if that does not move them, nothing can.

HON. MR. MEWS:—I may say that when I was in conversation with the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs recently he mentioned the fact that this Commercial Cable Company matter was one of the things on which he was working, as he recognised the waste-

fulness of letting the cable lie there when it could be of some use to the Colony.

HON. MR. SHEA:—I would confirm what the honourable gentleman has said. I heard the Minister of Posts and Telegraphs say the other day that he was negotiating some arrangements. I have no doubt that before long some action will be taken.

The House then adjourned.

MONDAY, July 12th, 1920.

The House met pursuant to adjournment.

The House went into Committee of the Whole on Bill entitled "An Act for giving effect to the Treaties of Peace between His Majesty and Certain other Powers."

Hon. Mr. Browning took the chair.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Is this Act based upon the Canadian Act o flast year which asked the Canadian Parliament to ratify the Peace Treaty with Germany and all of those enemy nations? By an amendment, power was given the Government to ratify any future treaties without the delay that would be inevitable if the treaties had to wait the subsequent assent of the Canadian Parliament. I would suggest the same course with regards to this Bill.

I wish to call attention to the fact that this is the first time that the Parliaments of the Dominions Overseas or Imperial Parliament has been called upon to ratify a treaty. In the British Parliament the Sovereign signs a treaty by virtue of his own authority and of the Government who advises him to do so. The Imperial Parliament hitherto has had no relationship with treaties at all, but under this new system and as a result of the stand taken by the people of the Overseas Dominions during the Great War this new thing has been adopted. We are a small colony to take part in the signing and ratifying of a treaty and I do not think for one moment that there would be any serious consequences if we refused to sign it. If Canada with its prestige, refused it would be a more serious matter.

Who ever expected four or five years ago, that Newfoundland would reach this position? It is due to the valuable services rendered by our lads both in military and naval affairs during the war, and I hope it will be a long time before treaties will have to be ratified by the same conditions. When they have to be ratified, however, I hope Newfoundland will be able to put her mark upon them.

The Committee rose and reported it had passed the Bill with an amendment.

The Bill was then read a third time and it was ordered that a message be sent to the House of Assembly saying that this House had passed the same with an amendment.

HON. MR. SHEA:—Mr. President, in moving the second reading of this very important Bill, entitled "An Act to Amend the Education Act," I should like to draw the attention of the House to some of the alterations and amendments proposed to the Education Bill. $n the Bill now before the House the most important one is the establishment of a Department of Education under the direct control of a Minister of the Crown. Considering the expenses paid from this department are eight or nine hundred thousand dollars, this is a further reason that it should be under the direct control of the Government. The principal point in the Bill is the provision for the establishment of a Normal School, one hundred thousand dollars being allocated for that purpose. An Advisory Board is to be appointed, the members of which are to be unpaid. The primary function of this Board is to keep questions clear of party politics. The work of the super-

vising inspectors is to keep the teachers as it were, on the hop, and to protect and help the trained teachers in the field. Twenty-five thousand dollars is the amount of money to be devoted to the assistance of teachers through the Normal School. One thousand dollars is provided for the purpose of enlarging the teachers salaries, and twenty-five thousand dollars are to be devoted to the equipment and renovating of schools, this is an increase of ten thousand dollars. Two thousand dollars is the sum to be used for the purpose of assisting broken-down teachers who may be in need of funds, and who were not included in the general scheme.

There are other alterations in the original Educational Bill, which do not call for any special comment from me at present.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Mr. President, I am not going to make extended remarks. It has been stated that it is proposed to close this session to-morrow afternoon. I have felt, and others also, that this is short notice to deal with this important Bill. In telephone communication with the Premier I expressed my views rather strongly, pointing out, that as far as I could see, the Education Bill was bristling with points which call for explanation, and possibly amendment. He asked for any suggestions I might have to make, and I said on my own account that the House would like to have an opportunity to get any explanations necessary from the Minister of Education himself. This is no reflection on the hon. member in charge of the Bill, the Minister will be able to go into the technicalities which others could not be expected to.

Provision is made for the appointment of the principal of the Normal School, it does not say who is to appoint the other remaining teachers. There is provision made for the taking of the annual census of children between the ages of 6 and 14. Why is this necessary? There is no provision for the cost of this. On page 2 the Minister is given power to suspend or cancel the certificate of any teacher under certain conditions, apparently the denominational power is abolished. This is not clear to me, I should like to have further explanation of the subject. The same may be said of Sub-Section (f). At present the examination of teachers is carried on by the different denominational organizations. I wish to be clearly understood, as to the denominational aspect. I am not making any reflection, I am merely saying we should have further explanation on the matter. Then the Minister has power to see that all educational appropriations are properly distributed amongst the various religious denominations. I should say that the different denominations would be more interested in seeing that they get their share of the money themselves, than the Minister in seeing that they get it. I should like also to have some light thrown on Sub-Section (h).

It is an extraordinary fact that the Superintendents are receiving more money than the Judge of the District Court here in St. John's. Sub-Section (i). Does that mean that new certificates will be issued to those who are already teachers? On page 3 sub-section (b) I notice no provision is made for the teaching of navigation. I know of nothing more necessary than the teaching of this subject. You say it will be taken up in the Normal School. This school is to teach teachers how to teach. Are we to imply that there is nobody able to teach navigation now? I think provision ought to be made for the teaching of this subject. What is badly needed is a large navigation school where most of our shipping congregates. The Normal School does not solve the problem, it won't be erected

for about two years and it will be about two anh a half before it is functioning. Then if we are going to teach teachers navigation, they will be two or two anh a half years before they go out. The subject is on the curriculum of the C.H.E. Yes, I know of one—a woman—who passed successfully the examination set in this subject some years ago. She answered all the questions on the paper.

HON. MR. GRIEVE:—Did she go to sea without a mate?

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—She was the sister of the late James McGrath. On page 5. The Advisory Board shall elect its own Chairman. Why should not the Minister be Chairman of this Board? He is evidently not to be on the Board at all. I do not see what the Board is to do if any issue should arise or if as a result of controversy representing elements withdraw. At present if any contentious question arises the three Superintendents deal with it. (Most of this is Dutch to me). You cannot run an Advisory Board comprised of eleven or twelve without things leaking out.

On page 6. The Board of Examiners are to be sworn. In what terms? Why are they to be sworn? What do they want to swear in examiners for? This ought to be specified. Sub-section (d) further down the page provides that the Advisory Board are to approve of plans of school buildings. Are teachers residences contemplated? No doubt all this can be explained. I might go on page after page in this way. I would just point out on page 8, section 22, sub-section (d), makes provision that a candidate for Supervising Inspector shall possess certain qualifications, and further on it states that a man or woman who has abandoned school-teaching for two years may be taken. Now I think it only right that if a plum is to be given it ought to go to the one who has stuck by the job. There are other things which we shall have to take up in the Committee stage, if not before. The Minister of Education, as I suggested before, might give us the information upon these points. I should like the House to be assured that we shall be able to get those points explained.

HON. MR. SHEA:—I have asked the Minister to come up and furnish the information asked for. Only one closely connected with this matter would be able to give the explanation required.

The Bill was then read a second time.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I would suggest that we defer the Committee stage until we have had the opportunity of hearing the Minister on this matter.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Shea the Bill "An Act Respecting Certain Retiring Allowances" was read a first time, read a second time, and the House resolved itself on a Committee of the Whole on the Bill.

Hon. Mr. Murphy in the chair.

Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment. On motion the Bill was then read a third time, passed and it was ordered that it be sent to the House of Assembly with a message that the Council had passed the same without amendment.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Shea the Bill "An Act Sixty-one Victoria (1898) Chapter Eight, entitled 'An Act Respecting Salaries," was read a first time, read a second time, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill.

Hon. Mr. Bell in the chair.

Committee rose and reported having passed the Bill without amendment.

On motion the Bill was then read a third time, passed, and it was ordered that it be sent to the House of Assembly with a message that the Council

had passed the same without amendment.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Shea the Bill "An Act for the Raising by Loan of a Sum of Money for Railway and other Purposes" was read a first time. In moving the second reading Hon. Mr. Shea said:

Mr. President, I may say generally that this Bill is for the raising of $1,000,000 towards the improvement of the Newfoundland railway and $500,000 for the development of the coal areas of the country. Both subjects have been fully ventilated within the last few days and the House is fully conversant with the pros and cons of the general situation. It is not necessary for me to say anything further here, but when we get into Committee details will be furnished.

The Bill was then read a second time and ordered to be referred to a Committee of the Whole House at a later hour.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Shea the Bill "An Act Further to Amend the Revenue Act, 1905," was read a first time, rea da second time, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill.

Hon. Mr. Templeman in the chair.

Committee on Bill entitled "An Act Further to Amend the Revenue Act, 1905," rose and reported the Bill without amendment. Said Bill was thereupon read a third time and passed, and it was ordered that a message be sent the Assembly that this House had passed the same without amendments.

House took recess at 5.35 p.m. until 6 o'clock.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea the Public Service Bill was read a first and also a second time. It was then referred to Committee of the Whole House.

Hon. Mr. Anderson took the chair.

The Committee rose and reported it had passed the Bill without an amendment.

The Bill was then read a third time and it was ordered that a message be sent to the House of Assembly to the effect that this House had passed the same without an amendment.

On motion the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the Bill "An Act for the Raising by Loan of a Sum of Money for Railway and other Purposes."

Hon. Mr. Mews in the chair.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—In view of the Round Table Conference we had outside I do not propose to make any extended remarks on this Bill further than to say for the benefit of any gentleman who may not have been in the conference that I think we are entering upon a risky experiment. I can quite see the position of the Government, that the Government's hand was forced, that nothing else was possible and that this money has to be provided in any event; rolling stock was necessary and certain other supplies to keep the railroad as a going concern for another twelve months, but I feel bound to reiterate what I said as to the desirability of taking the utmost precaution from a legal standpoint to see that anything that is done in this connection will not prejudice the country. This commission of seven will include three nominated by the Reids, and it may be that the minority will acquiesce in conditions that they cannot control but will nevertheless see to it that they can avoid any liability on the part of the company for anything that may be done by this commission. We have had a sad experience as to what arbitration between the Reids and the country means. When the reads got the telegraph it was supposed that it was as much as the company could do to make both ends meet, and at last the country had to meet $1,500,000 to compensate the Reids

for what they were supposed to have lost. Now we are to a greater or less extent taking from the Reid Company the control of the railroad. The directors may acquiesce; they have no other alternative. But at the same time they may protect themselves in some fashion I am not familiar with, but by some legal process, so that there may be material provided for some substantial arbitration thirty years from now, or more recently. The Canadian Government found itself during the period of the War while McKenzie and Mann were running the railway compelled to give large sums of money to them, and large sums to the Grand Trunk, and ultimately had to take these concerns over, with the result that the country lost $47,000,000. Now if we are to be faced with that, or even the remote prospect of it, even a remote contingency of proportionate loss, it becomes a very serious matter for the Government, and therefore I am glad to note from the Premier's statement that it is the intention of the Government to get a capable English company lawyer to deal with this matter, because I think everybody will agree that we cannot afford to pay many more millions now for experiments to railroads, particularly experiments in the nature of arbitration. I simply say this to place myself on record as recognising that the Government has to face a condition which renders some action imperative and that at an early date, but, on the other hand, unless the greatest care is exercised by the Government, the country may find itself in an awkward predicament.

HON. DR .CAMPBELL:—I may say, Mr. Chairman, that I wish to go on record on this question, that it is with no light heart that the Government to which I belong has taken hold of this proposition. For the last three months I have been a member of a sub-committee of Council investigating the Reid concern and the Reid operations, and it is only to save for this country a transportation system of some kind that we are asking for this loan. It is not for any love that the Government has for the Reids; it is no favor given the Reids, but it is our duty as a Government to keep this country with a transportation system. We may be caught in traps, and I think myself if the Reids, if the Reid Newfoundland Company, devoted more attention to legitimate railroad operations than in setting traps for the Government and people, they would have a better railroad and make much more money. They have been meddling in politics, and they have been as big a failure in politics as in railroading. During the general election I found around me Reid emissaries continually on the prowl night and day. The Reids were contractors of the Government and their duty was to be trying to run the railroad and boats which their contract called for instead of trying to make Governments and break Governments. I think the day of the Reid dynasty is done in this country, but it is only done when they are absolutely and totally defunct. I have no sympathy with them. I do not think the people have any sympathy with them. It is not for any sympathy or endeavor to help them out, but it is to assure to this country a transportation system that we are bringing in this Bill. We cannot in this twentieth century be without a railroad, without any bay services, and we are asking the people of this country for this money to assure this, and not to keep the Reids in this country.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Mr. Chairman, I might say that I am not here as an apologist for the Reids, and do not say whether this legislation is for them or against them. I simply say that the Government found themselves faced with some such situation

as the honourable gentleman has said. The point I wish to make is that it is necessary to make clear that the greatest precaution must be exercised by the Government; else we may find ourselves in a worse condition than we are now. We may be faced with claims, arbitrations and enormous leglilation. The gentleman I think is sincere and patriotic and desirous of protecting the country's interest. Many years ago the Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Bond undertook to make railroad contracts and deal with the situation. There are some in the other House, and I am not sure, but there may be some in this House, who were associated with him at the time. His intentions were of the best, his motives of the purest, his standing in connection with the matter was unquestioned, but the result was very disastrous to the country. It may be said to me in retort, Well, what better can you do? I do not know. I do not know the circumstances. I do not know the condition of the Reid Company, but I do say that we have had a painful experience here of what it means to have arbitration or connections of that sort with the Reid Company.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—I admit, with my honourable friend, that we are playing with the Devil's Fire, but our choice was having no railroad or securing this money to help patch it up. The Reid Company is defunct through a career of wasteful extravagance, not devoted to railroad operations. We are forced to this position very regretably, and I have no doubt that while we are here voting this money, they are setting traps to catch us, but we are doing our best.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Without any desire to prolong the debate I would point out that the facts I have cited with regard to Canada apply here. The people who were running the Canadian railroads may have been just as incapable as the honourable gentleman thinks the Reids are. The railway owned and worked by McKenzie and Mann and the Grand Trunk both went to smash in the same fashion. We see the Reids going to smash here. Whether mismanagement or politics, prehaps both, did their share in bringing about results in Canada, I do not know, but I do not think it follows that because members of the Reids family, are, as the honourable gentleman suggests, interested in politics, the condition of the railroad is due altogether to that. I think consideration may be given to the conditions the War brought about. I think those helped to some extent. I believe that caused the situation in the case of the Canadian railroad, but the fact remains that if, as the honourable gentleman says, the Reids have got the railroad and allied services into the condition they are because of their personal ignorance of railroading, the fact remains that in all other countries in the world, in all English-speaking countries, Canada, the United States and Great Britain, the railroads have got into a somewhat similar state.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—I would like briefly to refer to this Bill. I congratulate the Government that an effort is being made to improve the condition of the railroad. From my experience of the last few years, I think that something should be done. For the last four years we have imported large quantities of goods from the United States that arrived at Sydney, came across to Port aux Basques, taken back to Sydney for the want of proper facilities for drawing and proper tracks to carry it to St. John's. I am glad to find that it is the intention of the Government to give a portion of this loan to build a store at Port aux Basques that will accommodate the goods and that when the railway is in proper running order they will be able

to carry these goods and bring them to St. John's in a safe condition, because I am safe, Sir, in making this statement, there have been thousands of dollars lost to the trade in breakage, and goods destroyed, and pilfering. So far as the railway is concerned, the freight trains must themselves have lost enormous sums of money in transport, but, of course, I am not in a position to state what they must have lost during the period of the War, but with strict attention to the running of their railway, they must have lost hundreds of thousands of dollars. If you get a package sent to-day and it is received in a month here, or six months and sent back, you get no satisfaction as to what became of the goods. I welcome, Mr. Chairman, a Bill of this kind. I note the loan is to be floated at six per cent. I presume that will be at par, and when a country raises a loan, six per cent. is enough at any time. I quite agree with the Government's making an effort to have the railway put into such a condition, and I hope the money will be well spent.

HON. MR. TEMPLEMAN:—Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to delay the House on this Bill. I am very sorry we have to pass it. We are supposed to vote a million and a half to patch up the railway when we ought to vote seven millions in order to make it good. It is only throwing money away. I am very sorry to hear of the condition of the Reid Company. I have not very much against the Reids. They have been always good friends of mine. Referring to the traffic on the railway and the transportation of goods, about a year ago I sent a cargo of fish from Bonavista to St. John's. It was sent to Port aux Basques, and when we located it it was shipped back to St. John's, but we lost delivery of the fish and lost our contract. The railway business is more serious than any other. Therefore I think it requires the energy of all the men connected with it from the principal down, and even then there will be plenty of trouble and lots of mistakes. Now so far as the railway is concerned, we have a branch going to Bonavista. Before that branch started I was running six schooners. I said, now that the railroad is done we can do without the steamers, and we cut them down to two. Now to-day we have eight. What is the reason for this? It is largely due to the poor satisfaction that the Reid Newfoundland Company gave us on the Bonavista branch line. I hope this million and a half will be of some benefit, but I am afraid it will not.

House went into Committee on the Education Bill, Hon. Mr. Anderson in the chair.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Before the Bill passes I would like to say, and I think the House will agree with me how much we appreciate the manner in which the Government met us in discussing the details of this Bill and the satisfactory explanation of the various sections made. We secured the acceptance of the Government to an important amendment which will be dealt with when we come to it, but I think it will be agreed generally that no case has been made out for the creation of a Department of Education. There was no general demand for it, it was not promised in the Premier's Manifesto, and it seems to be a case of finding a place for a member of the Government. I agree that if a department is necessary we could not do better than appoint Dr. Barnes at its head, but at some future time some other Government having some capable blacksmith or fourth rate lawyer because of having been elected by a large majority and because of denominational or some other reason may get the appointment, but so far as the Bill itself is concerned in the creation of the department it appears to provide

no very important duties for the Minister except those formerly done by the Deputy Head of the Colonial Secretary's Department, and the overseeing of the Normal School. Now all these will I have no doubt be carried out very carefully by Dr. Barnes but I do not think any case has been made for the expenditure of some $30,000 on a department staff or army. Another argument put forward as a justification was that a sum of $350,000 was being spent and some Minister should be appointed to supervise that expenditure. Last spring when I was at Sydney trying to get back to St. John's, I met Premier Murray of Nova Scotia, who was there ill, and I had opportunity of discussion with him, and amongst other matters we spoke of Education. Nova Scotia has various educational an honor to it, and she should be proud of him, and I was sorry to note when he was here a few years ago he was not honored by his native land. We honored him in Canada. The children of this country had the brains and let us spend our money to devvelop those brains and give them a chance.
institutions amongst others. Dalhousie, Windsor, St. Farnics Xavier at Antigonish, Technical School at Halifax, Normal School at Truro and others, and every form of school down to the small elementary school, and Nova Scotia has no Minister of Education; Mr. Murray himself who in addition is Provincial Secretary-Treasurer is likewise Minister of Education and the educational department is under the supervision of a capable expert, Prof. McKay. That province spent last year on education against our $350,000, $2,097,000 without any Minister of Education, and I do not think we need one in this country, and I may say the same thing applies to New Brunswick.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—What about Ontario?

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I will come to that in a minute. Ontario has about three million people, and I quite agree that if Newfoundland had that many we would be justified in having a Minister too. But I am dealing with communities closely akin to our own in population, resources and circumstances. New Brunswick has several universities and technical colleges and everything down to elementary schools and have no need to create a Minister of Education with a large staff. I think it is another case of putting the trappings of an elephant on the back of a cat. My hon. firend shakes his head; I would not expect him to do anything else. Now that the Minister is created I presume Dr. Barnes will do the very best possible, still I think in that respect as well as in the matter of spending the revenue we have a long way to go before we shall see any result. I think we are multiplying the officials and with less of them much better work could be done if steps were taken to issure a full day's work from all the employees. I have been sitting in my office for some years past watching School Inspectors going up and down the hill, and I have a full day's work done before some of them go to work. I say that without meaning to be offensive to the gentlemen concerned. They are not the only ones in that respect; that is the characteristic of the Government official who goes to work at ten and quits at one. Back at three and quits at five, and while you have that sort of thing going on you will have lots of room to add to your staff, but if the work was done as lots of business people here do theirs, you would have more done and more satisfactorily. I instanced this afternoon the amounts these Superintendents are getting, who in addition to their salaries have been able to add several thousands more in extras, and some of them are getting more than the Judges of the Supreme Court. I come to a

class of people who get to work earlier, such the Superintendents of the Lunatic Asylum or the General Hospital, and they do not get as much salary as these Superintendents of Education. I am not going to delay the Committee, but want to put myself on record as regards the Bill. I think the department unnecessary and the amount of money spent on the staff too large, and the returns, not alone from the monetary point of view, if we get any, but the returns in increased efficiency will not measure up to the expense.

HON. DR. CAMPBELL:—I am sorry I can never agree with my hon. friend. We do not seem to agree on anything. However I must say, as an old teacher, that every dollar spent on education is money well spent, and that the state has no excuse to-day for allowing one of its children to grow up without education. We have asked for a large grant I admit, but we have put that grant under the most capable man in Newfoundland, who we very luckily had in Newfoundland at the time, Hon. Dr. Barnes. The next Minister might be anybody but I wish to point out that it is not the Minister in the department who does the routine work, but the permanent head, the Deputy Minister, and we shall see that the permanent head sarll be a capable man. The next thing he said was that Hon. Mr. Squires' Manifesto made no reference to a department of Education, but I would say he pointed out that the curse of illiterary must be wiped out in Newfoundland and we have taken the bull by the horns and hope to wipe it out. Now I never thought I should live long enough to find my hon. friend going to Nova Scotia for his standards. I can stand New Brunswick or Ontario, but I always thought Nova Scotia the blackest place outside of Hades, and I cannot stand that. My hon. friend is getting inflicted with this Canadian buy; I think, from his many sojournings abroad I have been so long out of Canada that I have lost that. But I think it unfair to have comparison all the time with Canada; I am sick of hearing that; I am meeting it part of every day and some of the night. I think we have a very happy choice in our Minister, as during the constructive period it is most important to have a Minister who is an educationalist. If there were loafers in the days of the late Government that is not our fault and if during those days my hon. friend saw supporters getting down late, he should not be reprimanding us, but should have attended to it then. I wish to give this Bill my support, and do it from my heart as I will know the advantages of education and how it heped me. I was sent here by Dr. Roddrick, one of the greatest Newfoundlanders the Island ever produced, and an honor to it, and she should be proud of him, and I was sorry to note when he was here a few years ago he was not honored by his native land. We honored him in Canada. The children of this country had the brains and let us spend our money to develop those brains and give them a chance.

HON. PRESIDENT:—I desire to say a few words on the Bill before the House and all the salaries we are voting out for the department, but would say I am not looking for any of those positions. But I think I might take some credit for myself with some twenty-four others some 45 years ago for bringing education here to what it is to-day. In 1875 we were very low down in educational matters, and some 25 of us in one denomination, many of them humble men, mechanics and tradesmen and we got together in an united manner and put up a building where we have 700 children and have no room for any more. Other denominations had to do likewise. We got a staff of teachers and thought we

were made and forever, but when those teachers came along we found the building we then had far too small for the requirements. It was about 70 years old and after three teachers were here for a short time they reported to their superiors in the Old Country that it was a pity they had such a small building, with the result we put up the building. I first referred to which cost over $80,000, and now we have fifteen teachers in that building and its surroundings. That I attribute in great measure for those men, and that denomination did not stand alone, because our brothers of other denominations had to do likewise, so that now all the denominations are vieing with each other in a friendly way to put out the best elements they can because they had as I know from the teachers as good an element among the boys here as you can find anywhere in the world, and we have some teachers there who have been in Canada, Australia, England, Ireland and elsewhere and they find the best material here. I congratulate the Government, altho I do not know any job that will be in keeping with my requirements, on this Education Bill, because when we spend money on education I think it is the best way of spending our revenue. No doubt we may have some slackers who may not do their duty in connection with this educational matter, as well as any other, because when it is a Government affair it is a slack job. But I do not think, because of what I know of the head of that department there will be any slackness because the requirements are so urgent; we require more education and all the facilities we can get and I think it is in the hands of the right man in the head of the department. I speak more particularly of the workingman's boys; the man who can afford to send his son to college has no need of assistance; but the son of the workingman is the one we have to depend on in this country. I am glad of this Bill and it should be given a fair chance by all people. I have much pleasure in supporting it.

HON. MR. MEWS:—I think the status of education in this country is justification enough for the Government's creating a department. If Government institutions are rotten as my hon. friend says, then this educational institution we have had so far has been extremely rotten in that all the nominal heads have been going in different directions, never reaching one point and have not been responsible to anybody. They have in a sensebeen responsible to the Governor in Council, but that fact has made for some confusion. My hon. friend also suggested in his paper that we have a parade of the Inspectors, and I think at the present time when there is a convention of teachers, it would be welcome by them who would then see that Inspectors are not a myth but a reality, because so far as some of them are concerned, they never see an Inspector from one year to another.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Do you think they will now?

HON. MR. MEWS:—Well I am satisfied under Dr. Barnes they will, and I think they will do good work under Dr. Barnes. They are going to be appointed for ability and not for political pull. They will survey the educational standing of the community in such a way that their reports will give us more information than we have gathered in years from the reports of the Superintendents, because their reports year after year have to say that they have not visited this school, and hundreds of schools in the same way. There are even schools in St. John's that have not seen an Inspector for years. It was also referred to that the Premier's Manifesto did not promise a Department of Education. My hon. friend is

politician enough to know that any reference to education would start such a riot that would not down in a generation. I do not say that it was left out on purpose, but education has been used too much as a bugaboo and a football by politicians and I hope to see the day when we shall have better opportunity for the poor boys as well as the rich, as the President has said. We have not reached that stage yet. The C.H.E. does not provide for the boys of poorer grades to get on, there is no opportunity for his advancement further on as the boys of rich parents have. If that could be wiped out we shall go a long way to improve the status of education.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—First with reference to the hon. gentleman opposite that I am always quoting Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. That is because the counties are similar and conditions mostly like our on and I do not know why it isn't more proper to quote Noca Scotia and New Brunswick rather than Ontario where conditions are so very different. With reference to what the President said in reference to the undertaking some years ago; I have heard it with much pleasure and can endorse it because I happen to be one of the boys who had the opportunity of enjoying the facilities placed at our disposal then which I would not perhaps have enjoyed otherwise, and no expenditure for education that I consider likely to attain similar good objects will have any criticism from me. I do not object to the expenditure for the purpose where education will be of benefit to the school boy or the teacher generally, but my objection is offered to the amount spent in creating a department which I consider unnecessary, and for the appointment of officials for which I find no need.

I fail to see anything in the general scheme which offers promise of anything substantial, except what will be brought about through personal effort. Dr. Barnes is, no doubt, an estimable man. There may be others, however, as well suited to this position. I am not prepared to say he is the best man for the job. What I said was, if the same amount of money expended in this department were applied to education generally, it would bring about as good results. The Minister of Health could have occupied this position, only that the political wheel went round and there was no need of creating a new position. Joking apart,—I would reiterate what I said as far as the department machinery is concerned, it is unnecessary.

HON. MR. TEMPLEMAN:—This is a very interesting Bill and one that should appeal to all of us. Education is neglected and sorely neglected. I can say this from experience.

Ten thousand dollars for night schools is a very small amount. Night schools are most necessary. There are thousands walking about the streets who could be better employed at night schools. It is surprising what advance can be made in these schools by those who have been unable to go to a day school. Provision is made for the shepherd but the sheep are forgotten. Children cannot go to school, if they want to, for there is not sufficient accommodation for all. It is just as bad in the outports as it is here. There are more children out of school than there are in. The same schools are being used that were used forty years ago. There is no provision made for building schools. There is one hundred thousand for a Normal School but what about the elementary schools? If a chance to get an elementary education is given to a boy he will earn his own way. I do not know anything about the Normal School, but I am strong in favour of Night Schools. What about the undenominational system? I thought we were going to have

common schools. I do not see a word about it in this Bill. It seems to me it is all inspectors and no schools; I do not agree withall this Bill says. There are certain things I should like to see in it, which are not there. Dr. Barnes, I daresay, will do some good, but he does not strike at the root of the matter.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—I just wish to say a few words on the education question. It would, of course, occupy many hours to discuss it. There is no better capital we can send into the world than a man with a good education. I hope the development during the next quarter of a century will be of such a nature that no one will be able to say that his lack of education was a serious handicap to his progress. Education will be in the twenty-five years to come, the salvation of the country, and it will place our young men in positions that have been before unknown. Compulsory education is not mentioned in this Bill. Every boy and girl throughout the length and breadth of this country should have at least, an elementary education. I hope after the experience of one year's operation of this Bill the Minister will see his way clear to deal with compulsory education. Many children at the age of fourteen leave school, through no fault of their own. There should then be a compulsory night school for them to attend up to eighteen years of age, which should compel them to attend school not less than eight hours a week. The salaries of teachers are disgracefully low, they range in many cases, from $250 to $350 up to $500. I say more money is consumed in cigars than we pay the teachers of the schools of this country.

The Committee rose and reported it had passed this Bill with an amendment.

The Bill was then read a third time, and it was ordered that a message be sent to the House of Assembly that this House had passed same with an amendment.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—In relation to Municipal affairs. I wish to point out that most of us are familiar with the reason why this Bill is introduced at this session of the legislature. It is really not a permanent Bill, because there may be amendments made at the next session. Except we pass this Bill we have no Muncipal Council after the 31st day of December next. No doubt there are some sections which do not meet the wishes and views of some of the hon. gentlemen in this Chamber, but as pointed out, this measure has been before the late Government and previous Government for some years, and for some reason or another has not been dealt with—due probably to its voluminous nature. Only some person who has made a particular study of legislation and of this Bill is capable of explaining it in detail, so that the hon. gentleman may get knowledge of it. I ask that this Bill be taken up and passed in order that the term of the Council may not expire and so that the city may not be without representation. I will endeavour to take up and give whatever explanation I am able, as to the meaning and purpose of the different sections of the Bill.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—I replying to the hon. gentleman introducing this Bill, I do not wish to detain the Bill, but there are a number of sections not acceptable. In his opening remarks the hon. gentleman said it is a temporary Bill and amendments are anticipated. The election of the Municipal Council depends upon the passing of this Bill, I presume in its entirety.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—Not necessarily. It is not a Government measure. It is the result of a deliberation commission which sat some few years ago.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—Seeing it is not necessary that the Bill pass in

its entirety, why not leave out the clauses likely to be objected to, till another session, and pass that portion which will legalize the election of the Council for next year—that portion of the Bill that will legalize an election and the formation of a Council next year at the expiry of the Commission. They can work under bye-laws until such time as the Legislature has an opportunity of considering these several clauses. Once we pass these clauses many of them will not be amended. I for my part think many of them most radical and that the Mayor of the City will be a greater autocrat and have more power than the Kaiser had. I do not want to take up the time of the House, but would ask, is it necessary that a Bill should be passed that an election may be held in December, and then in January have this Bill brought forward and discussed. I ask the honourable gentleman if it is not reasonable that we legalize and send down to the House of Assembly a Bill that will legalize the holding of an election next year, and defer the other clauses. As the Bill goes through Committee stage I would object to very many of the clauses, but I think that we can very easily pass some of them.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—Mr. President, when the honourable gentleman in charge of this Bill introduced it he gave very satisfactory reasons so far as I am concerned why the Bill should pass this session; otherwise I would simply object to many sections of it. The Bill that I hold in my hand is the work of a Commission of which I was a member for three years. Since that time it has been put before a Committee of Citizens. The original charter contained 398 sections and 301 sub-sections. The amending Bill which is supposed to be the Charter of this Bill has 391 sections and 280 sub-sections, a lack of seven on the one side and twenty-one on the other. I also hold in my hand, Mr. President, a letter that was written to the Minister of Finance and Customs by the Citizen's Committee on the 9th of July. In this letter the Citizen's Committee while they are in favour of the passing of the Charter at this session object to many sections of this Bill.

Sections 10, 11 and 12 open up the question of plural voting, to which the Committee objects.

Section 15. For 1922 read 1920. Otherwise there will be no voters' list prepared for the election this year, with the consequent disfranchisement of the majority of the electors.

Section 11. The majority of the Citizen's Committee objected to biennial elections on the ground of expense.

Section 40. Advertise Council's bye-laws and regulations in at least two daily papers.

Section 46. The Committee strongly recommended that no monies be voted at secret meetings of the Council. Neither should contracts be entered into at such meetings.

Section 57. The northern boundary of Bannerman Park has been omitted, probably by a printer's error.

Section 75. When intending to open up lands for building sites, the Council should advertise in two city daily newspapers.

Section 76. The Committee strongly recommended that care should be taken that "only the owners of the freehold of the property on which the improvements are made shall pay for said improvements and that owners of adjoining property shall not be taxed directly for said improvements."

Sections 78, 79 and 80. These sections should apply only to new streets and not to old streets where people have been paying taxes for years. Note also that the words in 78 "or adjacent thereto which may be benefitted"

should be also inserted in 79 and 80. This will prevent building sites near hte Railway Station being taxed for improvements made near the Customs House, for both places mentioned are on the same street.

Section 90 (a). The Committee has probably registered its objection to this "prescribing the class of house" on the grounds that it may create restricted areas.

Sections 102 and 107. The cost of repairs or renewals of these pipes should not be borne by the owner of the house, as he should not be responsible for faulty work performed by the Council's employees.

Section 120. The turning off of water for non-payment of taxes. This might make the tenant suffer for neglect of the landlord to pay his taxes.

Section 130. The owner of property should not be compelled to pay half the cost of the curb and gutter in addition to half the cost of the pavement. The former should be paid for altogether by the city.

Section 132 (c). See note on Section 130.

Section 160. The Committee's recommendation as to this Section (160 in former Bill) was accepted by the Joint Committee of both Houses of the Legislature. This made it clear that the Section will apply to new streets only or extensions of old streets. Why has this been changed back again?

Section 185. Put "Suitable receptacles" for "Metal water tight covered" ash cans. Why should an ash can be watertight?

Section 220. This quadruples the tax on merchandise in stock.

Section 238. January 15th is too early for a new Council coming into office on January 1st to complete its estimates. January 31st is better. The Governor in Council is given only two weeks in which to disallow increases in taxation. This does not give Citizens or the Governor in Council much time to consider such increases. Make it four weeks.

Section 243. The Secretary-Treasurer is given too free a hand in issuing warrants of distress. He should receive instructions from the Council in each individual case. The Citizens' Committee is especially insistent on this. It was one of the chief reasons for its coming into being.

Section 248. The Commission to collect arrears should not be remunerated for collecting any 1920 taxes.

Section 249. This leaves it doubtful as to whether tenants, who pay their taxes indirectly in the rent, are not also liable for the Poll Tax of five dollars.

Section 264. This Tax of two per cent. on fire insurance premiums has been charged by the Companies to Policy holders.

Section 283. For the date see note on Section 238.

Section 229. See that sanitary carts are legibly numbered.

I wish to draw the attention of the honourable gentlemen to Section 192.

person to slaughter cattle, the flesh of

192.—It shall not be lawful for any

which is to be sold for human food, in any building within the city limits unless the same has been authorized and approved by the Council for the use and purpose of a slaughter house or abattoir. Any person contravening the provisions of this section shall be liable to a fine not exceeding one hundred dollars or in default to imprisonment for a period not exceeding three months.

Now, Mr. President, I have every respect for anyone who goes into a business of this kind and invests capital. I believe that we should have slaughter houses and that they should be well managed and well equipped and cleaned with a perfect flow of water.

Now what is an Abattoir—(French

abattre to slaughter) a public slaughter house. The first abattoir were those of Paris, established in 1818, on the recommendation of the Commission of 1810. In the construction of an abattoir careful consideration must be given to the selection of the site. It must not be near dwelling houses; it should admit of extension, and control should be had, if possible over every building in the immediate neighbourhood; it should be easy of access adjacent to the cattle market and railways, a good water supply is most important. The abattoir must include accommodation for lairing, killing, dressing, cooling, inspection of suspected animals and meat, and various buildings for the treatment of the feet, intestines and blood. The slaughter house proper ought to be separate from the rest of the building—and in no case should an Abattoir be built near where people live.

The best abattoir that I have known builtin the Old Country is in Birkenhead, and when the question was brought before the authorities there they said "Well you can build it, but we will tell you where to build it, and it is a long way down the River." Now, Mr. President, I am not going to occupy the time of the House, but as I have got the assurance that it is the intention of the Government to handle this Charter at an early date during 1921, I readily consent, so far I am concerned, to support, and assist in any way possible anything that will be the means of keeping the Commission in power for a general election at the end of the year. I wisn, Mr. President, to be perfectly clear that I was one of the Commissioners that had to do with the original charter, and it was not a unanimous charter, because there are many sections throughout that are only a huge joke; some sections are only bye-laws, and why should we have in an Act of Parliament bye-laws to guide the Secretary-Treasurer of the Municipal Council, the Solicitor, the Auditor, the Medical Officer, and Sanitary Supervisor?

I am going to inform the House that I wish the building and housing regulations in this Charter to be wiped out, and I tell you why. It has been submitted to committees, but not to committees of builders and contractors, and many of the housing regulations are only bye-law regulations. My friend, the Hon. Mr. Browning, has referred to the sections of taxation. As he has pointed out, these require the greatest scrutiny, but there is one here, Mr. President, to which I want to call the attention of the honourable gentlemen 263.—Every Bank doing business in the City, except the Newfoundland Savings Bank, shall pay to the City on or before the fifteenth day of February in each year a tax of one-sixteenth of one per cent. upon the volume of business done by the Bank within the City during the preceding year. Such volume of business shall be ascertained by adding together the amounts standing on the books of the Bank on the thirty-first day of December preceding, as returned to the Minister of Finance and Customs under the Consolidated Statutes, 3rd Series, under the following heads in the Schedule to said Act, namely:—

(1) Current loans to the public.
(2) Current loans to the Government.
(4) Amount of bills and notes under discount.
(5) Deposits bearing interest, payable after notice.
(6) Deposits not bearing interest.
(7) Deposits in Savings Bank Department.
(8) Deposits by the Treasury payable on demand.
(9) Deposits by the Treasury payable after notice.

Provided that in no case shall the tax

payable by any such Bank be more than three thousand dollars annually; and provided further that no bank hereafter commencing business in the City shall be liable for the said tax until the fifteenth day of February next after one complete calendar year shall have elapsed from the date of such commencement.

The point I wish to make, Mr. President, is that when you tax banks you are going too far, and I further object, Mr. President, t otaxation by a corporation. I can readily understand the Government of a country through the Minister of Finance, the Prime Minister or the Executive, taxing people, but why a public corporation should ask information from banks is beyond my comprehension.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Is not legislation like that effective everywhere?

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—I do not mind so far as the Government is concerned. I am not advocating any point here on behalf of the banks, because the banks are well able to look after their own interests. If the Council wants to tax the banks, let them, but why should a public corporation ask for such information as is here? The Municipal Council owes $1,500,000. If the want to incorporate, let them raise a loan of $2,000,000, pay off the Government, and then incorporate the city. They still owe the Government one and a half million.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Could you give us some idea of the general financial condition as indicated by this Bill?

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—That is a very hard job for me.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Not for you, I hope.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—During the last three years, because I am safe in saying I know of many houses today that are paying $160 and $200 that before the war were not worth $25, so that the owner of the house will have something substantial to pay, and serve him jolly well right for putting up the rents so much. Stock brokers on margins. Well the amount of money passing through these people's hands must be enormous and if anyone is in a position to pay a decent tax it is that class of people. Commercial travellers not domiciled in the Colony $20. When I was in the Council under Hon. George Shea as Mayor, an effort was made to put a tax of $200 on Commercial Travellers and I strenuously opposed it then as I oppose $20 now. I should put on a tax to bring them in, not to keep them out, because we need them. Now I support this Bill or charter on the one condition, that if a Commission has been appointed to run the city government until the end of the year we shall have an election and immediately after whether in January or February it shall be dealt with in a proper spirit and go into the details as we have a right to. Under these conditions I support the second reading. There is one other matter, and that is Schedule B on page 93 re Warrants and Distress. Is the Council going to give plenary power to the Secretary-Treasurer on his own responsibility to sell when he likes? I say no. If the Council are not prepared to take the responsibility upon themselves to give instructions to do so, then I say cut Schedule B out. They must take the responsibility as a whole and not give it to one man.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—Does the hon. gentleman know what is the revenue now?

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—The estimate revenue for 1920 is $345,055, and I shall draw the attention of hon. gentlemen to the fact that the interest provided for is $72,000, and that provision is made for an expenditure in Sanitary Department alone of $80,000 to carry

away filth, and muck and mud, enough of money to, capitalized at $1,200,000 @ 6% to give everybody in the town water and sewerage connections.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—This is about the "witching hour of midnight, when churchyards yawn and graves give up their dead." I think it is time we should bury this bill. It is the most remarkable example I know of governments legislation. It is five or six years now since this question of a Municipal Charter or reformed Municipal Bill was first under discussion in the Lower House but invariably when it came to the point, some pretext or excuse sufficed to put it off for another year. I have been constantly as a journalist protesting against a Bill of this capacity of 390 sections being brought into the legislature in its last hours of a session, and I submit now it is most unfair for an institution calling itself a deliberative body in the last moment without having had opportunity to consider this Bill and pass its various clauses. It is a Bill that affects some members of the House very considerably and all of us somewhat. None have had opportunity of discussing it, and speaking for myself I am not prepared to take a bill of this kind and agree to putting it through without having had opportunity of discussing it and maybe amend it. From a cursory glance I have been able to give it seems to me the machinery is altogether too elaborate. I do not know why it should be necessary to have a bill of 390 sections to run the affairs of the town of St. John's, or why it should not be cut down to about one third. Somebody said a number of sections in the charter seem to be of a character that would be more appropriately bye-laws that would be made by the Council, published in The Royal Gazette and obtain the force and effect of law, like so many more of the provisions contained in Acts of Parliaments which we have been passing here. If the bill had come in early in the year I am sure members of this House would have been glad to give the time necessary for its consideration. We have already passed an Act providing for the carrying on of Municipal Government, and I think the proper course to adopt would be to continue that Commission for another six months, and put this bill over until the early days of the next session and I think could be introduced in the form it stands now. These bills might be locked up and put on our desks next session and could be discussed then as it ought to be. I have never in an experience of this legislature in one capacity or another of nearly 30 years, seen a bill of such a nature offered for consideration of the legislature in the last few hours. I am not saying this as a reflection on the Government, but on the other hand I think this House will be abundantly justified in declining to make a farce, if I may say so, of its functions, by undertaking to deal with a measure of this kind in an hour or two. I therefore move that this Bill be read a second time this day six months.

HON. MR. MURPHY:—I second the motion. I do not think we can do justice to the bill or to ourselves by taking it up at this late hour, and the best thing I think is to hold it over till next session.

HON. MR. MEWS:—As one of the members of the Citizen's Committee appointed about four years ago, I much regret the fact that it is left to this late hour to bring the bill in. I have read it several times since then and once during the last 24 hours and there are sections in it that I know would not appeal to many members of this House, but during the day I took the position it would be all right to let it go through and then the public would lnd out any anomalies and during the

election in December would be able to voice any objections they have, and which I think they would have to some of the clauses. I now simply rise to regret that some of the members I find are not willing to let the bill go through as it is. Not being a property owner I perhaps do not feel as strongly as those who are fortunate enough to own property and unfortunate enough to be taxed, as no doubt they feel they are, somewhat heavily.

HON. MR. GIBBS:—I have to admit that there is a great deal of force and argument in what has been adduced by hon. gentlemen against having this bill passed during the closing days of the House. The bill is certainly one of magnitude and the many provisions in it and sections dealing with property rights and civic government require a good deal of care and attention, but we must not forget that this bill has been before the city for some years and it is unfortunate that it cannot be considered and discussed in all its details and given all that consideration which the importance of the measure deserves, but as the sentiment of the House is certainly not in favor of passing this bill in its closing days I am not therefore in a position to offer very strenuous objections to the motion that the bill be read this day six months. I regret the House is not in a position to consider the bill in all its details. Having been for four years Mayor of the City and knowing that the city cannot be properly governed and the many problems which the city possesses cannot be handled and solved except a bill of this character be passed, it is unfortunate we are not in a position to deal with it as its importance deserves.

HON. MR. BROWNING:—As I started this affair possibly, perhaps it would be well to give an expression of my own feelings and I think the feelings of this House. Now there is no disposition on the part of any member of this House, on the business community whatever, and I think all will realize it is very necessary that the town of St. John's should have much greater funds than is at its disposal at present time. We all regret the many disadvantages the town of St. John's is under owing largely to the incapacity of those who had the handling of the affairs of the town, previously. But I think we have arrived at a stage when the people generally are taking interest and would like to have the town made so that we would not be ashamed to take strangers in any part of it ,and I do not think any person in this town who is taxable would have any objections to be taxed in a reasonable and equitable and proper manner. But there are many things in this Bill that appeal to a man of ordinary business experience that are not of that nature or disposition that would encourage or aid proper city government, and that disposition we lack in this country very much; the patriotic disposition and the endeavour to improve things and have our town beautiful and made so that we may be proud of it. Nobody can be proud to-day of St. John's. It is absolutely a filthy hole, and we are ashamed to bring strangers within it. Nobody can contradict that. And the community at large now are disposed to put their hands in their pockets and make this town what it should be, a very beautiful and capable city, which it should be if we get the proper legislation and the funds to carry it out. I support the motion of Hon. Sir Patrick McGrath; there are a large number of sections I oppose, not fully, but would rather amend, and I think it would be well, and wise indeed that this bill be put off and taken up next session in plenty of time that the full attention and the best endeavour of the members be given to the framing of a pro-

per city charter so that the members of the Council would feel dignified in occupying the position and honour by being members of that body and give their best endeavours. Under this I do not think that would be, but next session the bill could be brought in and inspire the members of the Council with some enthusiasm and the endeavour to improve the conditions in St. John's.

HON. MR. ANDERSON:—I wish briefly to state in taking part at the outset the requiem of this bill as I started at the outset, I am a sort of father, altho it has been considerably amended since 1916. In a few hours we shall be called here to the closing of the House, and in the dying hours of this session we are asked to devote our time and give our interest to a bill containing hundreds of sections, this is more than human beings can handle. I am satisfied, Mr. President, if it is the wish of the House, that it should remain until next session. I support the motion that this Bill be read six months hence.

The motion being put, it was carried accordingly.

HON. MR. SHEA:—Mr. President, looking to the fate of the Municipal Bill, and in view of the fact of the recent legislation passed here which only provides for the government of the council up to December (?), it is important that some arrangement be made to provide for this contingency. I therefore move the first reading of the Bill entitled "The Appointment of a Temporary Commission for the City of St. John's."

On motion it was read a second time and the House then went into Committee of the Whole on this Bill.

Hon. Mr. Bell in the chair.

HON. SIR P. T. McGRATH:—I have strong sentiments with reference to the contemplated building of an abattoir within the city limits. I have feelings that such ought not to be permitted in a main thoroughfare, where it is likely to prove not only an eyesore but perhaps a nuisance, this depends on the character of the institution to be erected. On general principles I feel that such buildings ought not to be allowed within the city limits. In the past the law required all slaughter houses to be built beyond the city limits. Manufactories and establishments of this character should be sufficiently far away to remove objections, which exist with reference to them, and to make our principal streets so that it is possible for people to pass to and fro, especially streets used by passengers going to or from ships.

HON. MR. PRESIDENT:—I should like to say a few words on this matter. Butchers have been prevented by the Municipal Council from slaughtering cattle within the city limits. Whether slaughter-house or abattoir be the name given I don't think the nature of the regulation changes. Butchers have had to abide by the regulation and if slaughter-houses are forbidden, I do not see why the same thing, only called by a nicer name, should be permitted to be erected. I hope the Government won't allow that to take place.

HON. MR. SHEA:—I may say that the Government will accept the amendment made by the hon. member.

The Committee rose and reported it had passed the Bill with an amendment.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Shea the Bill was read a third time and it was ordered that a message be sent to the House of Assembly informing them that this House had passed this Bill, and to request the concurrence of that House on this matter.

The House then adjourned until 2.45 to-morrow afternoon.

TUESDAY, July 13th, 1920.

The House met pursuant to adjournment.

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 then pleased to assent to the Bills passed during the session. His Excellency then read his Address from the Throne.

After which the Honourable the President of the Legislative Council, by command of His Excellency the Governor, declared the General Assembly prorogued.

INDEX

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Motion for, 11.
Committee on, 16.
Presentation of, 51.
Governor's Reply, 51.

ANDERSON, HON. MR.

On Resolution of Condolence, 8.
Speech from the Throne, 28, 32.
Food Control Bill, 48,
Agricultural Bill, 118, 122.
Housing Bill, 173.
Municipal Bill, 224.

AGRICULTURAL BILL, 97, 99, 122.

BISHOP, HON. MR.

On Speech from the Throne, 28.
Certificate of Masters and Mates Bill, 124.
Exportation of Codfish Bill, 131.

BROWNING, HON. MR.

On Speech from the Throne, 9.
St. Lawrence Timber, Pulp and S.S. Co., 62.
Municipal Bill, 227.

BUSINESS PROFITS TAX, 97, 122, 126.

BEAVER BILL, 104, 128.

COMMISSION OF INTERNAL ECONOMY, 28.

CONDOLENCE, RESOLUTION OF

On Death of Hon. George Skelton, 6.
Hon. A. F. Goodridge, 6.
Hon. John Harvey, 6.

COMMISSIONS.

Hon. J. D. Ryan, President, Legislative Council, 4.
Mr. George Shea, 5.
Dr. Alexander Campbell, 5.
Mr. Frank Steer, 5.
Mr. John Browning, 6.

CAMPBELL, HON. DR.

On St. Lawrence Timber, Pulp and Steamship Co., 68.
Agricultural Bill, 114.
Railway Loan Bill, 216.
Education Bill, 220.

CERTIFICATE OF MASTERS AND MATES BILL, 97, 99, 127.

COMMEMORATION DAY BILL, 156, 161.

COMPANIES BILL, 165.

DEPT. OF PUBLIC WORKS BILL, 28, 38, 51, 53, 54.

DEPT. OF MARINE AND FISHERIES BILL, 51, 53, 61, 62.

DEPT. OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS BILL, 51, 53, 54, 104, 126.

DEATH DUTIES BILL, 84, 89, 93.

DEBENTURE BONDS ISSUE BILL, 97, 100, 126.

DOMINION CO-OPERATIVE HOUSING BILL, 170, 172, 206.

DOGS, KEEPING OF DOGS BILL, 208, 209.

EXPORTATION OF CODFISH BILL, 97, 101, 127, 194.

ENEMY ALIENS BILL, 122.

ELECTION BILL, 162.

ESTATES OF DECEASED ESQUIMAUX BILL, 209.

EDUCATION BILL, 212, 214, 223.

FOOD CONTROL BILL, 19, 17, 28, 38, 50.

FIRE PATROL BILL, 84, 89, 93.

GRIEVE, HON. MR.
On Speech from the Throne, 11, 19, 34.
Information respecting the Codfishery Bill, 85.
Agricultural Bill, 120.
Exportation of Codfish Bill, 130, 190.
NEWFOUNDLAND PATRIOTIC FUND BILL, 206.

GIBBS, HON. MR.
On Resolution of Condolence, 6.
Profiteering Bill, 95.
Exportation of Codfish Bill, 142.
Housing Bill, 198.
Municipal Bill, 223.

GRAND BANK HARBOR BILL, 83, 88, 90.

GOVERNOR, HIS EXCELLENCY
Opens Assembly, 4.
Assents to Bills, 127.
Prorogues Assembly, 231.

INDUSTRIAL SOCIETIES BILL, 28, 38, 48.

INFORMATION RESPECTING CODFISHERY BILL, 51, 53, 54, 89.

INCOME WAR TAX BILL, 94, 104.

JUDICATURE BILL, 61, 62, 66, 67, 84.

LIGHTING OUTPORT STREETS, 84, 89, 93.

LEGISLATIVE DISABILITIES BILL, 84, 89.

LICENSE TO CUT HARDWOOD BILL, 122, 155, 162.

LOCAL AFFAIRS BILL, 156, 161.

MUNICIPAL BILL, 170, 223, 230.

MacNAMARA, HON. MR.
On Speech from the Throne, 25.
St. Lawrence Timber, Pulp and S.S. Co., 70.
Exportation of Codfish Bill, 139.

MEWS, HON. MR.
On Food Control Bill, 39.
Profiteering Bill, 112.
Education Bill, 221.

MILLEY, HON. MR.
On Exportation of Codfish Bill, 80, 82.
Profiteering Bill, 96.

MONTREAL TRUST COMPANY BILL, 97, 126, 127.

McGRATH, HON. SIR P. T.
On Profiteering Bill, 106.
Exportation of Codfish Bill, 137, 193.
Housing Bill, 195.
Education Bill, 213.
Railway Loan Bill, 216.

NEWFOUNDLAND MEDICAL BOARD BILL, 38, 48.

NEWFOUNDLAND PATRIOTIC FUND BILL, 206, 207.

PROFITEERING BILL, 89, 104, 122.

PUBLIC ROADS BILL, 156, 159, 169.

PROTECTION OF ANIMALS BILL, 156, 162.

PAPER, PULP AND WOOD PRODUCTS BILL, 165, 194, 206.

PUBLIC SERVICE BILL, 215.

PRESIDENT, HON. MR.
On Resolution of Condolence, 8.
Education Bill, 220.

PETITIONS.
Bishop, Hon. Mr., 73.

REGISTRATION OF MIDWIVES BILL, 84, 89, 93.

RETIRING ALLOWANCES BILL, 214.

RAILWAY LOAN BILL, 215.

REVENUE BILL, 215.

RYAN, HON. MR.
On Exportation of Codfish Bill, 101, 103, 134.

SHIPBUILDING BILL, 51, 53, 58, 61, 90.

STANDARDIZATION OF CODFISH BILL, 51, 53, 54, 61, 84.

SURVEY OF FOREIGN-GOING AND LABRADOR VESSELS BILL, 61, 62, 64, 84.

ST. LAWRENCE TIMBER, PULP AND STEAMSHIP CO., LTD., BILL, 61, 62, 67, 72.

SUSU STEAMSHIP COMPANY BILL, 84, 89, 93.

STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATES BILL, 84, 89, 92.

SEALFISHERY BILL, 128.

ST. JOHN'S PILOTAGE BILL, 128, 156, 162.

SALARIES BILL, 214.

SHEA, HON. MR.
On Speech from the Throne, 17.
Judicature Bill, 72.
Certificates of Masters and Mates Bill, 123, 128.

STEER, HON. MR.
On Speech from the Throne, 11.
Profiteering Bill, 104.

SELECT COMMITTES
On Address in Reply, 16.
Standardization of Codfish Bill, 61.
Information respecting Codfishery, 61.
Shipbuilding Bill, 61.
Certificates of Masters and Mates Bill, 125.

TENANTS BILL, 97, 122, 127.

TRUSTEE INVESTMENT BILL, 207.

TREATIES OF PEACE BILL, 212.

TEMPLEMAN, HON. MR.
On Certificates of Masters and Mates Bill, 100.
Exportation of Codfish Bill, 101.
Education Bill, 222.

WOMEN'S PATRIOTIC ASSOCIATION BILL, 51, 54.

WINTER, HON. M.
On Speech from the Throne, 37.
Profiiteering Bill, 110.